NLY

ornia
al
y

Ex Libris
K. OGDEN

Peterborough.

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

ANTIENT METAPHYSICS.

VOLUME FOURTH.

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY OF MAN.

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

RELATING TO THE

FILLE SAUVAGE

WHOM THE

AUTHOR SAW IN FRANCE.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR BELL AND BRADFUTE; AND T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND, LONDON.

M,DCC,XCV.

III
M174
v.4

CONTENTS.

PREFACE Page i.

INTRODUCTION p. 1

BOOK I.

The Hiſtory of Man.

CHAP. I.

Of the difficulty of defining *Man*.—This difficulty ariſes from its being neceſſary to define what he is by Nature.—Ariſtotle the only author who has defined Man.—His definition explained, and the full definition given tranſlated into Engliſh.—All the operations of the Human Mind, the animal as well as the intellectual, proceed from Compariſon.—The wonderful chain of things in Nature, to be ſeen in the progreſs of the Human Mind.—This definition of man not intelligible to thoſe who have ſtudied only the Philoſophy of Mr Locke.—The author's apology for pretending to teach a better philoſophy than any that has been invented in modern times.—The propriety of defining Man by his comparitive faculty and the capacity of intellect and ſcience.—Nothing ſaid of the Body of Man in the definition;—nor has Ariſtotle any where elſe ſaid that he is by nature erect.—The contrary is now found to be the caſe.—The facts by which this is proved.—The wonderful progreſs of Man, from a quadruped to ſuch an animal as he now is.—Of the world of art which he has created,—and made all the Powers of Nature ſubſervient to him. p. 11

CHAP. II.

Of the ſeveral ſteps of the human progreſſion from the Brute to the Man.—The Author has ſeen three ſtages of that progreſſion;—*firſt*, Peter the Wild Boy;—*ſecondly*, The Ourang Outang, of whom the Author has diſcovered ſome facts, ſince he publiſhed upon the ſubject:—*thirdly*, The Wild Girl in France.—She was an amphibious animal.—Several particulars concerning her mentioned. p. 25

CHAP. III.

The firſt ſtep that men made, in their progreſs to civilization, was to learn the uſe of their own body—*firſt*, By erecting themſelves; then by learning the uſe of their

101554

hands; and, *laſtly*, to ſwim.—Swimming not natural to man; but his acquiſitions in that way wonderful.—Till man learned the uſe of his own body, he could not provide ſufficiently for his ſubſiſtence.—At firſt he lived upon the natural fruits of the earth.—Theſe failing, he took to hunting and fiſhing, being able to live upon any kind of food.—But only agriculture could furniſh ſubſiſtence for numbers of men, living together in cloſe communication.—Before ſuch an art could be invented and practiſed, language was neceſſary. Page 35

CHAP. IV.

Of the habitation of man in the natural ſtate.—It was in caves, which nature furniſhed, or which he dug out of the rocks.—This proved by the authority of antient authors —and monuments ſtill exiſting.—Man as various in the form of his body, as in any thing elſe.—Of men with tails.—Of Satyrs, with feet of goats, and with horns upon their heads.—This proved by the teſtimony of *St. Jerome*.—Of men without heads, but with eyes in their breaſts;—and of men with only one eye in their forehead.—Theſe facts atteſted by *St. Auguſtine*.—Of men with the heads of dogs—proved by the teſtimony of ſeveral authors.—Of the Sphynx.—The exiſtence of ſuch an animal only atteſted by Agartharchides.—This author had a very good opportunity of being informed.—His work is extant, and bears no mark of fable or romance.—No proof that ſuch animals did never exiſt, that they are not now to be found.—Reaſon why they ſhould have ceaſed to exiſt.—The wonderful variety of the outward form of man, as well as of his inward form.—Of the variety of the ſize of men in different ages and different nations of the world.—The civilized life makes a great difference in this reſpect.—But there is a difference alſo in the natural ſtate.—This proved by the example of the Ourang Outang. P. 43

CHAP. V.

Of the character of man in his natural ſtate.—Not known what his character was in the firſt ſtage of that ſtate, when he was a quadruped;—but from what we know of the Ourang Outang, man in the ſecond ſtage of his progreſſion, is a ſocial, friendly animal, and capable of intellect and ſcience.—To judge of a man in the civiliſed ſtate, after he has got the uſe of language, a diſtinction is to be made betwixt thoſe who live by hunting, and thoſe who ſubſiſt upon the fruits of the earth.—The inhabitants of the Pelew Iſlands a ſpecimen of what men are in the firſt ſtate of civiliſation, and before they are hunters.—The wrong conſtruction given by ſome men to the behaviour of the inhabitants of the Pelew Iſlands towards us.—The behaviour of the New Zealanders as noble and generous as that of the Pelew men.—A remarkable inſtance of their behaviour given. P. 54

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the progreſs of man from a natural ſtate, to a ſtate of civility and arts.—Such a progreſs abſolutely neceſſary.—The firſt ſtep of this progreſs was living in herds.—Of the motives which induced men to live in that way.—Animals divided, by Ariſtotle, into gregarious and not gregarious;—and into political and not political.—Man of the mixed kind—both gregarious and ſolitary; political and not political.—Man not induced to aſſociate by inſtinct, or any particular attachment to his ſpecies—proved that he has no ſuch attachment.—It was therefore neceſſity or convenience that made him aſſociate.—This the caſe of the Ourang Outang.—Men in that ſtate lived like brutes, though they were both gregarious and political.—Examples of other animals living in that way.—That way of living far removed from a ſtate of civility and arts.—Language abſolutely neceſſary to form ſuch a ſtate.—Man muſt have formed ideas before he can have the uſe of ſpeech.—Language a wonderful art, but the formation of ideas more wonderful.—The formation of ideas our firſt ſtep from the mere animal life.—This is a moſt difficult ſtep, being from nature, where all things are mixed with all.—The progreſs of ideas, from the loweſt ſpecies to the higheſt genius.—We diſcover differences of things, and divide as well as unite.—Of the *Categories*, by which the whole things in the Univerſe are reduced to certain claſſes.—This the greateſt diſcovery of philoſophy that ever was made.—But the human mind goes beyond the Categories, and diſcovers what contains the Categories, and every thing in the Univerſe.—This progreſs moſt wonderful, from what is loweſt in nature to what is higheſt.—Language neceſſary for that progreſs.—Therefore it is the parent art of all arts and ſciences.

Page 60

CHAP. VII.

Of the progreſs of the human mind from ideas to Science.—Ideas the materials only of Science.—They muſt be put together in order to make ſcience.—This done by propoſitions.—All propoſitions conſiſt of a praedicate and a ſubject.—The *praedicate* the more general idea, containing the *ſubject* being the leſs general idea.—Of the manner in which one idea contains another;—and how the more general idea contains and is contained in the leſs general.—This explained by the diſtinction betwixt containing *potentially* and *actually*.—This diſtinction ſhewn to apply to all propoſitions, whether praedicating the genius of the ſpecies, or the accident of the ſubſtance.—Propoſitions alone not fit for ſcience.—There muſt be that compariſon of propoſitions, which we call *Reaſoning*.—Where the connection betwixt the two Terms of the propoſition is not evident, it muſt be made ſo by other propoſitions.—This cannot go on in *infinitum*, but muſt ſtop at ſelf-evident propoſitions.—Of the proceſs of reaſoning from theſe

theſe propoſitions, and of the collection of propoſitions into Syllogiſm.—Of the wonderful invention of the Syllogiſm, and of the whole logical works of Ariſtotle.—Syllogiſm alone not ſufficient for Science.—There muſt be alſo Definition.—Of the nature of Definition.—The terms of propoſitions may conſiſt of ſeveral ideas, expreſſed by ſeveral words.—This illuſtrated by the example of the firſt axiom of Euclid.—Definitions, therefore, as well as Axioms, neceſſary for Science.—Of the utility of Logic, and the neceſſity that a man, who pretends to be learned in any ſcience, ſhould know what ſcience is.—*Opinion* among men, prior to ſcience or demonſtration.—All men, when they firſt begin to think, form Opinions,—and moſt men never go farther. Polybius's definition of Man, *that he is an opinion-forming animal.*—This not ſo good a definition as Ariſtotle's.—Ariſtotle gives a ſyſtem of reaſoning from Popular Opinions, which he calls Dialectics; and with this, and his treatiſe *De Sophiſticis Elenchis*, he concludes his great work of Logic.—Summary of this work. Page 71

CHAP. VIII.

Of the neceſſity of arts and of ſciences and a regular polity among Men.—Without theſe, men cannot be happy though aſſociated; and in certain circumſtances may be moſt miſerable.—This proved by the example of the people of Paraguay in South America.—Of the two Authors, Charlevoix and Muratori, who give us the hiſtory of this people.—The laſt may be thought the more credible hiſtorian; but Charlevoix's Narrative well vouched.—The country of Paraguay of prodigious extent.—The inhabitants of it living under no government, not even the family government, except in time of war;—the moſt ſavage and brutal people we read of;—no faith or honeſty among them, nor ſenſe of the *Pulchrum* and *Honeſtum*;—addicted to the uſe of ſtrong liquors, which made them ſtill more barbarous;—very dull and ſtupid when the Jeſuits came among them, but capable of being taught;—more diſeaſed than any civiliſed people.—This accounted for.—Example of other men who have lived in a brutiſh manner, but not ſo brutiſh as the Paraguaiſe before they were civiliſed.—Of the hardſhips and dangers the Jeſuits went through in civiliſing them.—Had the greateſt difficulty to get at ſeveral of theſe nations, through deſarts and foreſts.—Had their languages to learn;—and their Sorcerers and Magicians to encounter.—Their greateſt obſtacle was their apprehenſion of the Spaniards making Slaves of them when they were Chriſtians.—Of the martyrdom the Jeſuits ſuffered, to the number of 30.—Of the oppoſition they met with from the Spaniſh noblemen who governed the commaderies.—Notwithſtanding all theſe obſtacles, the Jeſuits in the beginning of this century had eſtabliſhed 30 Miſſions.—The greateſt order and good government in all thoſe miſſions.—The Jeſuits did not chuſe that the number

in

in any of their miſſions ſhould exceed 6,000, as they thought great numbers could not be well governed;—were very attentive to the education of the youth, teaching them all the uſeful arts of life.—Nothing the Savages learnt ſo well as muſic,—learned the uſe of arms, and performed great actions both againſt the Indians and Portugueſe;—not deſerted by the Jeſuits when in the field.—Oppoſition given to the arming them with fire arms.—Of the diviſion of property among them.—No money allowed among them.—Were made moſt zealous Chriſtians.—Became Apoſtles themſelves, and ſuffered martyrdom.—An account of their happy ſtate, given in a letter by the Governor of Paraguay to the King.—The love they bore to their teachers, and their teachers to them.—Of the methods by which the reformation was brought about.—1*ſt*, By Religion:—The Indians tamed and civiliſed by the Jeſuits, in the ſame manner as the Greeks were by Orpheus.—2*dly*, By Muſic, in the way that Amphion civiliſed the Greeks:—The Jeſuits may alſo be compared to Prometheus.—3*tio*, By Government the Indians were civiliſed.—Without government Man an imperfect animal.—Obſervations upon the Men of Paraguay in their wild ſtate.—The ſtate of civilization and government abſolutely neceſſary to make men live in an orderly way.—The Paraguaiſe wanting theſe, and having the uſe of ſtrong liquors, the wildeſt people that we have ever heard of.—No ſenſe in them of the *Pulchrum* and *Honeſtum*, which cannot be but where there is government.—Of the diſeaſes to which they are liable; and the reaſons why they are ſo much diſeaſed.—Of the difference betwixt them and the inhabitants of the Pelew Iſlands, and the New Zealanders.—Of the methods uſed by the Jeſuits to civiliſe them; and firſt Religion.—This natural to man.—All men who have the leaſt uſe of reaſon, muſt be convinced that beings ſuperior to man exiſt:—Theſe beings they will obey.—It was not by teaching only that the Jeſuits made Chriſtians of the Indians, but by a worſhip of pomp and ſhow.—Of their proceſſions and triumphal Arches.—A particular deſcription of them.—Muſic, a great part of the Religion, to which the Indians were converted.—Of the natural power of Muſic over man; without it the Savages of Paraguay could not have been converted.—The laſt method the Jeſuits uſed, was the eſtabliſhment of a good Government among them.—This was a Religious Government.—The beſt Government in Antient times, ſuch as the Heroic Government in Greece, was connected with Religion.—The ſtory of the civiliſation of theſe Savages, a renewal of the Hiſtory of Antient times.—To be conſidered, whether Religion be not as neceſſary for continuing good Government among men, as for introducing it.—Of the diſperſion of the Jeſuits;—a great blow to learning;—compared to the diſperſion of the Pythagorean Colleges in Magna Graecia.—Of the noviciate of 15 years, the Jeſuits went through before they were admitted into the order;—were not only taught themſelves but teached others;—after they were admitted, they were diſpoſed of by the ſuperior of the order according to their different geniuſes.—Not known what is become

become of the Miſſions in Paraguay after the diſſolution of the order of Jeſuits.—Their parting with their Diſciples moſt ſorrowful.—If they had not choſen to leave them, the power of Spain could not have forced them.—Might have eſtabliſhed many more Miſſions,—and made a new Empire, and a new World of Learning in that Country. Page 82

BOOK II.

Of the Invention of Arts and Sciences.

CHAP. I.

The ſubject of this book is the invention of Arts and Sciences, beginning with the Art of Language.—Language not natural to Man, but an Art.—Men herded, and carried on ſome common buſineſs before they Spoke.—Language began with animal cries, varied perhaps by ſome articulation, in imitation of certain Birds;—varied alſo by Muſical Tones.—By ſuch a Language no progreſs could have been made in Arts and Sciences.—The Chineſe Language not fit for Arts or Sciences:—Theſe, therefore, among them all, put into hieroglyphical writing even their law buſineſs.—A Language of Art neceſſary for the invention of Arts and Sciences.—This the moſt difficult of all Arts.—Proof of this:—*Firſt* as to articulation.—This performed by the organs of the mouth operating variouſly.—The firſt organ of ſpeech that appears to have been chiefly uſed, is the throat.—By this guttural ſounds are produced, ſuch as the Ourang Outang uſes, the Wild Girl that was ſeen in France, and the Huron in North America.—Articulate ſounds divided into vowels and conſonants.—The nature of theſe explained.—The vowels few in number, the conſonants many.—The conſonants much more difficult in pronunciation than the vowels.—Differences from thence accounted for, betwixt the barbarous and civiliſed Languages.—Another difference betwixt the barbarous and civiliſed Languages, is the extraordinary length of the words of the barbarous Languages:—This accounted for.—Of the origin of articulation.—It could not have been brought to any perfection, but in a country where it was ſtudied and practiſed as an Art.—Of the progreſs of articulation from monoſyllabical words to words of ſeveral ſyllables.—Of the variety in the ſound of Language by diphthongs;—and by vowels and conſonants, aſpirated and not aſpirated.—Language muſt have been analiſed into its elemental ſounds, before the ſound of it could be made ſo perfect.—Of the melody and rhythm of Language.—Of the expreſſion of ideas by Language.—Theſe of number infinite;—but divided into certain claſſes or parts of ſpeech.—This diviſion correſpondent to the diviſion of our ideas into Categories.

ries.—The number of words appear to be infinite;—made comprehenſible in our memories, by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.—Of Syntax, and the neceſſity of it.—Concluſion, that Language is the greateſt of all Arts.—Objection anſwered, That children learn to ſpeak without Art.—Speech, though a moſt common thing, is very wonderful:—An account given how it is learned;—of ſo difficult invention, that it would have been a miracle, if Peter the Wild Boy had ſpoken when he was firſt caught, or if the Ourang Outang could ſpeak.—Objection anſwered, to the Ourang Outang's being a Man, That he is the only Man, that has been found, who could not ſpeak.—General obſervations upon the invention of Language. Page 104

CHAP. II.

The Queſtion here to be conſidered, is, In what country or countries was a Language of Art invented?—Language not invented by every Nation that ſpeaks it.—This proved by the examples of the Goths, the Laplanders, and the Greenlanders.—As Language is the moſt Antient Art among Men, it muſt have been invented by a very Antient Civiliſed Nation.—Men muſt have been aſſociated, and lived upon the natural fruits of the Earth, before Language or any other Art could have been invented. A regular Polity neceſſary for that purpoſe, and a claſs of Men ſet apart for it.—Laſtly, Genius and Natural Parts required.—The Egyptian Nation, is that in which all the requiſites above mentioned for the invention of Arts, concur. p. 128

CHAP. III.

The Egyptian nation undoubtedly a very antient civiliſed nation.—None can pretend to be ſo antient, except the Indian.—A regular Government among the Egyptians in the moſt antient times.—This atteſted by Moſes.—No other regular Government then known.—Of the wonderful number of Kings there according to Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, from Menes the firſt human King, down to Amaſis.—Of the number of years theſe Kings reigned.—The antient hiſtory of Egypt a matter of curoſity, as well as the antient hiſtory of Greece.—Both to be conſidered as part of the hiſtory of *Man*.—The *ſecond* thing required, of a country where language was to be invented, is that it ſhould be abundant of the natural fruits of the earth.—This the caſe of Egypt.—The *third* thing required, is a regular government fitted for the invention and cultivation of arts.—This alſo in Egypt.—The *laſt* thing required, in a country fit for the invention of language, is that the people ſhould have good natural parts.—This alſo the caſe of the Egyptians, as is proved by the authority of ſacred and profane writers. p. 132

CHAP. IV.

Of the neceſſity of Arts being invented in Egypt —Other Arts mentioned as invented in Egypt, beſides the Art of Language.—And, firſt *Agriculture*, by which only Men could ſubſiſt in the ſame place in conſiderable numbers, and ſo have a cloſe communication together.—Before this Art was invented, the Egyptians ate one another; and ſo did the Greeks.—This Art came from Egypt to other Countries, and particularly to Attica.—The Art alſo of making Drink, as well as Food, for Men, invented in Egypt, *viz.* the Art of *Fermentation*, by which both Wine and Ale are produced. Page 137

CHAP. V.

Of the invention of Clothes.—Theſe not neceſſary in the Natural Life.—The firſt clothing among Men were Skins.—The country of Egypt maintaining ſo many Men, could not likewiſe maintain ſo many Beaſts as were neceſſary for furniſhing Skins to Cloth ſo many People.—Therefore Clothing by Linen invented;—alſo by Cloth made of Wool,—for both theſe Clothings, the Arts of Spinning and Weaving were neceſſary.—The uſe of Linen went from Egypt to few countries.—To the Egyptians therefore we owe not only our Bread, our Wine, and our Beer, but our Clothes.—The Egyptians muſt have diſcovered the uſe of Fire for the practice of thoſe Arts.—This diſcovery not made by all nations in the firſt ages of Civility.—Of the Art of Building invented in Egypt:—Metallurgy neceſſary for the practice of that Art.—The Egyptians made the ſubject of their Art, not only every thing on the earth, and in the air and water, but what was in the bowels of the earth.—The way that Men were ſupplied with inſtruments of peircing hard ſubſtances, before the invention of Metals.—Diviſion of Time into certain portions neceſſary in Civiliſed Life.—The firſt diviſion of time into Days, that is, the interval from one riſing of the Sun to his riſing again.—The next portion of Time, obſerved by Men, was from one new Moon to another, called from thence a Month.—This the only diviſion of Time known to barbarous nations.—The Solar Year firſt diſcovered in Egypt.—That year, as firſt uſed by the Greeks and Romans, very irregular.—The Romans got the irregularity of their year corrected from Egypt.—What was wanting to make that correction perfectly accurate, ſupplied by Pope Gregory *XII.*—Of the diviſion of time into Weeks.—This invented in Egypt, and by the Egyptians carried to India.—From the Egyptians it came to Greece, and from Greece to us. p. 144

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Religion, and the neceſſity of it to conſtitute and carry on a good polity.—The opinion of Mr David Hume upon this ſubject, very different from that of Cicero.—Religion not known to *Man* in his natural ſtate,—nor in the firſt age of civility.—This proved, firſt by *Reaſon*, and then by *Facts*,—and firſt as to *Reaſon*.—It ſhews that *Man* in the natural ſtate can have no ideas at all; and, in the beginning of civility, only ideas of corporeal ſubſtances,—but no ideas of inviſible powers acting upon body, without which there can be no idea of God.—This idea only to be acquired in proceſs of time after the invention of different arts.—Secondly as to *Facts*; it is proved by the example of the Ourang Outang,—Peter the Wild Boy,—the Wild Girl in France,—the people of the Pelew Iſlands,—thoſe of New Zealand—of New Holland, and particularly of Botany Bay.—Objection anſwered, from the example of the Indians of North America, who have got the notion of a great ſpirit.—This they muſt have got from a people farther advanced in arts and civility, who are proved by monuments ſtill exiſting to have been once in that country.—That the idea of a God is not an innate idea; no innate ideas of any kind. Page 150

CHAP. VII.

Impoſſible that the Egyptians, who had invented ſo many arts and ſciences, ſhould not have been Religious.—They were the moſt Religious of all Nations.—Religion here conſidered as a Political Inſtitution, which produced no bad effects among the Egyptians, as it has done in many other Nations.—If it produced no bad effects, where there was ſo much of it as in Egypt, it muſt have produced good effects.—Difference betwixt the Religion of Egypt and that of other Countries.—In other Countries the Gods only predicted events; in Egypt they were Kings, and Governed.—Of the nature of the Egyptian Gods.—They were embodied, were born, and died; and were of different Characters.—They were of that claſs of Beings called Dæmons.—This opinion ſupported by the authority of Plutarch, Plato, and other Authors quoted by him.—Proved from theory that ſuch Beings as Dæmons muſt exiſt, otherwiſe there would be a void in the univerſe, which cannot be ſuppoſed to be in ſo perfect a Syſtem.—Agreeable to the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, that ſuch Beings ſhould be ſent among men, to aſſiſt them to recover from their fallen State, by teaching them Arts and Sciences.—This was done by the Dæmons in Egypt.—This happened in other countries as well as in Egypt, particularly in China and Peru.—In Peru there was an Oſiris and an Iſis, under the name of Manco Capuc and his Siſter-wife.—Authorities from Scripture to prove the exiſtence of Dæmons.—They may be ſup-

poſed to have been the Beings called, in Scripture, Angels, who had the ſuperintendency of human affairs.—Each Nation had its Angel.—A bad tranſlation of a text on this ſubject in our Bible.—*The Sons of God*, who, we are told, copulated with the Daughters of Men, muſt have been Dæmons.—This interpretation of the text ſupported by the authority of the Fathers of the Church.—It was natural that thoſe Dæmons in Egypt ſhould be the objects of Popular Worſhip there;—but the learned Egyptians made a diſtinction betwixt the Popular Religion and the Religion of Philoſophers.—Proof of this from their knowing the doctrine of the Trinity.—A great deal of Rites, Ceremonies, and Pomp in the Popular Religion of Egypt.—The ſame in the Religion of Greece and Rome;—alſo in the Religions of the Jews.—Proof of this from Scripture.—Muſic a conſiderable part of the Religion of all Antient Nations;—very much attended to by the Egyptians.—The Antient Muſic among them carefully preſerved.—Of the Oracles in Egypt.—By them only the Egyptians divined.—From them Oracles came to Greece, but not to the Romans, who divined only by the Flight of Birds and Entrails of Beaſts.—Of the Egyptian Oracles.—Theſe were given by the Dæmons who had Reigned over them;—difference in that reſpect betwixt the Oracles of Egypt and of Greece, as well as betwixt the Gods of Egypt and of Greece.—Of the deceit and impoſture of the Greek Oracles.—Of the Sacred Animals among the Egyptians.—Theſe were types of their Divinities.—Better repreſentations of Divinity than any thing inanimate, ſuch as Braſs or Stone.—By means of theſe Sacred Animals, the Egyptians lived with their Gods, more than any other People;—and were the moſt Religious of all People;—and alſo the Happieſt.—Obſervations upon the difference betwixt the Religion of the Philoſopher and the Vulgar.—A Religion of contemplation, ſuch as that of the Philoſopher, not fit for an uninſtructed Mind. Page 155

CHAP. VIII.

Of Government, and the general Principles upon which it muſt be founded.—Of the importance of Government,—without it there could have been no arts or ſciences among Men; nor of conſequence any Religion.—Even Religion without Government could not have made men happy.—Therefore Government a moſt important part of the hiſtory of man.—Men firſt lived in herds,—then in families.—Examples of men living in that way in antient times, and even at this day.—Of the Union of families, States were formed.—There Government became neceſſary.—Every State muſt conſiſt of the Governors and the Governed.—It is nature that muſt fit men to govern or to be governed.—The Greek Philoſophers have ſaid too little of *nature*, and ſeem to have ſuppoſed that *education* in the matter of Government was every thing:—Of the difference of men by nature,—ſome fit to govern, and ſome fit to be governed.—Of Heſiod's diviſion of men:—The firſt claſs of that diviſion only fit to be governors.

governors.—Theſe muſt be very few in every nation.—The excellency of the ſpecies, *Man*, confined to a few races, like that of other ſpecieſes.—The two other claſſes of men fit only to be governed, but in different ways.—No education can make men fit to govern, who by nature are not qualified:—How it was firſt diſcovered that men by nature were ſo qualified.—It was by the look, the figure, and the ſize.—In this way men were diſtinguiſhed in the herds;—and ſtill more in the ſocieties formed of families,—of theſe were the firſt founders of States and Rulers.—This proved by the example of the firſt States of Greece.—No States could have been conſtituted without ſuch men.—The deſcription of ſuch men by Homer.—Of the heroic Kings in Greece.—Theſe not Dæmons, like the firſt Egyptian Kings, but mere men that came from Crete or Egypt.—Of the heroic form of Government,—of the qualifications neceſſary for the governor of ſuch a ſtate.—The ſame form of Government among the Indians of North America.—Obſervations upon the neceſſity of eloquence for carrying on a free Government.—The antient heroic Kings excelled in that art.—The account of thoſe Kings given by Homer, an important part in the hiſtory of man.—They were the nobleſt race of men that ever exiſted.—No exaggeration by Homer in their characters and manners;—all thoſe heroes of noble birth.—The value of horſes depends upon their birth.—No diſtinction betwixt men and horſes in that reſpect.—In later times, the diſtinction of birth obſerved, particularly among the Athenians and the Romans.—The bad conſequences of the neglect of that diſtinction, particularly among the Romans.—The ſame diſtinction of birth obſerved in modern times, particularly in the Knights of Malta.—No diſtinction of races of men now, as there was in the heroic times.—Of the degeneracy of the beſt races of men by impure mixtures, and by an improper education and manner of life.—Example of one heroic race being preſerved by living in a proper way.—The Government in Rome under the Kings, the ſame with the heroical Government.—Better under one King than two Conſuls.—Of the defect of the heroic Governments in giving ſo much power to the people.—The conſequence of that in Athens and in Rome.—Another objection to this heroical Government is, that it was not fitted for the improvement of arts and ſciences.—Theſe defects remedied in the Government of Egypt. Page 173

CHAP. IX.

The queſtion to be conſidered is, Which is the beſt form of government among men?—That the democratical is the worſt, the author ſuppoſes in the preceding chapter.—That it is ſo, proved *a priori*, from the nature of man and of government:—Proved alſo by fact and experience,—particularly by the example of the Athenians, a people, the cleverest that perhaps ever exiſted; yet they could not govern themſelves.—When they ceaſed to be governed by the laws which Solon gave them, or by

by eminent men, that got the lead among them, their affairs went into the greateſt diſorder, and their State was ruined.—Their ſeizing the public money, and applying it to their maintainance and pleaſures, one of the chief cauſes of their ruin.—This made them live an indolent and pleaſurable life, which made them unfit for the great wars, wherein they engaged—of their loſſes in the Peloponeſian war,—which had like to have ended in the total deſtruction of their city.—By the peace which they were forced to make, they were ſubjected to thirty tyrants.—One chief reaſon of their ill ſucceſs in the war, was their ſuſpicion of all the men of eminence among them,—which made them practice that extraordinary form of proceſs called Oſtraciſm.—Example of that in the caſe of Ariſtides.—They might perhaps have taken Syracuſe, if they had not recalled Alcibiades from that expedition.—Their reaſon for recalling him, a moſt frivolous one.—The adminiſtration of their affairs at Rome in ſome inſtances accompanied with the greateſt injuſtice,—an example of this in the condemnation and execution of fourteen of their ſea commanders, who had obtained for them a ſingle victory.—Their democratical form of government corrupted their manners,—and made them a people quite different from their anceſtors.—Their government a moſt compleat democracy, where *Liberty and Equality* were in the higheſt perfection.—No other example neceſſary to prove how bad a government democracy is, than the example of France before our eyes;—more folly, madneſs, and crimes, committed under that government by the French, than there is any example of in any other nation in the ſame ſhort ſpace of time.—Monarchy the beſt form of government.—It is the government of the Univerſe, and the firſt government among men—ſo much founded in nature, that it takes place occaſionally even in conſtitutions of which it is no part,—as in the caſe of the Dictator among the Romans.—Of the perpetual Dictator in Rome, and then of their Emperors.—One eſſential difference betwixt the democratical and monarchical governments, that the democratical never can be a good government, but the monarchical, though not reſtrained by laws, may be a good government;—two chances for that, if the King be a good King, or his Miniſter a good Miniſter.—The particular happineſs of Britain is to have both good.—Nothing can make men deſirous of a change of ſuch a government, but the infection of the French madneſs;—proper means uſed to prevent that. Page 188

CHAP. X.

Of the government of Egypt.—That government very antient,—as antient as the days of Joſeph;—no other regular government then on earth, except in India:—But that government derived from Egypt.—All governments conſiſt of the governors and the governed.—Of the governors in Egypt.—The government there monarchical, which the Egyptians thought the beſt government.—The King in Egypt had only the executive power.—A higher claſs of men were his Counſellors.—To them were intruſted

ed the religion of the country, and arts and ſciences.—The excellency of every man, in every art and ſcience, muſt depend upon his natural genius and his education,—of theſe two the firſt is principal.—Nature muſt lay the foundation of excelling in all arts.—Of the difference betwixt the philoſophy of the Egyptians and that of the Greek philoſophers, as to the natural diſtinction of men.—The Greek philoſophers thought that education alone was ſufficient to make a good governing man.—The Prieſts of Egypt were the governing men there.—The name which they gave themſelves:—They were kept quite diſtinct from the reſt of the people,—had the cuſtody of religion, and the care of arts and ſciences.—Theſe two neceſſarily connected.—Without having cultivated his intellectual faculties, no man can have a juſt idea of ſupreme intelligence.—The reaſon for this.—Further proofs that there is a natural difference of men.—A great diſtinction of men in India in antient times.—This is ſtill to be ſeen there.—This diſtinction of men every where to be found,—even in the new diſcovered World in the South Sea.—No doctrine more abſurd than that of the natural equality of men.—The moſt pernicious doctrine when applied to government.—Other claſſes of men in Egypt, ſet apart and diſtinguiſhed from the reſt.—And firſt the military claſs.—Some obſervations upon that claſs.—They belong to the 2d order of men mentioned by Heſiod.—The other claſſes conſiſt of men who are neceſſary in every ſtate, being ſuch as provide the neceſſaries of life for the people.—Difference betwixt Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, as to the diviſion of them.—To make the diſtinction of men among the inferior claſſes, a matter of great difficulty.—It was the work of the Dæmon Kings in Egypt, who formed the polity of Egypt.—This polity formed before the expedition of Oſiris into India,—not the work of any of the human Kings.—Providence interpoſed to promote the progreſs of men towards their recovery from their fallen ſtate, by the improvement of their intellectual faculties.—This he did among the Jews, to whom he gave a law and conſtitution, by his Angels and by Moſes. This he did alſo in Egypt, but not in ſo ſignal manner, as among the Jews.—It was proper that a difference ſhould be made betwixt the two nations.—Of the education in Egypt.—There the beſt education poſſible; for it was domeſtic,—all arts and ſciences there hereditary, and continually increaſing from generation to generation.—This education compared with the education among us, and the education among the Greeks and Romans.—Nature and Education never ſeparated among the Egyptians.—Where that ſeparation is made, the characters of men can never be perfect.—Of the manner of living of the Egyptian Prieſts.—This too qualified them to excel in arts and ſciences.—In this likewiſe very different from men of ſcience in other countries.—It was therefore neceſſary, that they ſhould excel the Greeks and every other nation in arts and philoſophy.—The Egyptians had not among them the arts of poetry and rhetoric.—Nor did they cultivate muſic ſo much as the Greeks did, as it was no art of pleaſure among them.—

Sculpture

Sculpture and painting practiſed among the Egyptians, but more cultivated among the Greeks.—The Greek genius, particularly ſuited for the fine arts.—Of the election of the Kings in Egypt.—The Prieſts there were electors,—but had not ſo great power over the Kings, as the Prieſts of Ethiopia had, though the Egyptians were a colony of Ethiopians, aad though there was a great ſimilarity of cuſtoms and manners in the two nations.—Of the diviſion of land in Egypt. Page 201

CHAP. XI.

Obſervations to prove that the Egyptian form of government was moſt perfect.—The Egyptian government had not the fault of the heroic governments, nor of the later governments in Greece, that of being too popular.—The conſequence of a popular government is, giving power to men who can neither give nor take good council.—The government of Egypt had not another defect of the heroic governments in Greece, viz. that it was not fit for the cultivation of arts and ſciences.—Leiſure required for that, and a claſs of men ſet apart for that purpoſe.—This the Prieſts of Egypt had.—Antient learning never could have been reſtored in Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries, if men had not been ſet apart for that purpoſe.—Objection to the Egyptian government, that it was not a free government, ſuch as the heroic governments.—Anſwer, that it was not a popular government, and ſo much the better for not being ſuch;—reaſon for this.—Objection, that the people in Egypt were governed like ſlaves.—Anſwer, that they were ſo wiſe, as to ſubmit willingly to the government eſtabliſhed among them, and not to obey through fear or by compulſion.—This was the caſe of the Capadocians of old, and the Peaſants at preſent in Poland and Ruſſia.—The conſequences of the people being taken from their private buſineſs to attend the Public, is their poverty.—Examples of this in Athens and Rome.—They will deſire to make profit of the Public; and that will produce faction and corruption.—No Slaves in Egypt.—That proved by the ſilence of Antient authors upon that ſubject, and by the preſent practice in India.—Seſoſtris did not make Slaves of his Captives, but employed them in public works.—Slavery, an impolitical inſtitution,—not neceſſary in Egypt, as it was in Greece and Rome.—No indigence in Egypt, ſuch as in modern Nations, and was in antient times.—No money there.—Commerce carried on by exchange.—No great eſtates.—That prevented by the Agraran law, dividing the land among three orders of the State.—No foreign luxury in Egypt, as they had no trade with other countries.—A ſingular thing in the Hiſtory of Egypt, that they made no Provinces of the Countries they conquered,—nor impoſed any tribute upon them.—The Egyptians, not only happy themſelves, but a public bleſſing to mankind, by importing arts and civility among them.—The three great articles of the political ſyſtem, are the health, the morals, and the numbers of the people.

ple.—As to health, the Egyptians the healthieſt of all civiliſed nations;—uſed Phyſic, not only to cure diſeaſes, but to prevent them.—As to morals—theſe better in Egypt than in other countries, becauſe they were the moſt religious of men,—and had not thoſe temptations to vice, which other nations have by wealth and by indigence. —Land their only property; which could not be accumulated in the hands of individuals.—As to numbers, theſe were wonderful in Egypt.—A particular account of the number of Cities under Amaſis and Ptolemy Lagus.—This number of Cities more to be depended on than the numbering of Men.—Reaſons given for the wonderful increaſe of Men in Egypt.—All marrying, and having children.—All children brought up at the ſmalleſt expence.—And children not dying under age, as ſo many die among us.—One extraordinary reaſon for the increaſe of people, was the addition to the country of the *Delta*.—This muſt have added very much to the numbers of the people, as well as to the increaſe of learning.—The Egyptian Government thus proved to be the beſt that ever exiſted; and the moſt fitted for the cultivation of arts and ſciences.—The duration of the Government of Egypt, a proof of its excellency.—No changes made in it during a prodigious number of years.—No diſputes about the ſucceſſion to the Crown, till the Greeks came among them.—The Ethiopian Kings to be conſidered as of the ſame country.—Proof of the perfection of the Government of Egypt, is the duration of the ſame Government in India, notwithſtanding all the conqueſts that have been made in that country.—People in India divided in the ſame manner as in Egypt.—The Hindoos of India, a very happy people.—Antient Egypt to be conſidered as preſerved in India. Page 220

CHAP. XII.

Compariſon of the preſent State of Egypt with its antient State.—The change more for the worſe than in any other country.—In Herodotus's time, it was a country more wonderful than all the other countries upon the earth.—Of its climate, and its river. —The climate not liable to exceſs either of hot or cold, dry or wet.—The changes of theſe produce many diſeaſes among men.—The river more wonderful than the climate.—It has created a country in Egypt,—and makes this country wonderfully fruitful by renewing the ſoil of it.—Without that, the land of Egypt could not have laſted or maintained ſo many people.—Examples to prove this.—The Nile made agriculture in Egypt a very eaſy art, which is ſo laborious in other countries.—It delivered them from the reproach of feeding upon dung.—The river, beſides, yielded many plants of different kinds, upon which the inhabitants of the marſhy part of Egypt lived.—The land of Egypt fertile as well as the water.—It produced wheat and barley which grew wild there, and no where elſe.—Of the works of art in Egypt.—The *firſt* and greateſt work of that kind, the mounds of earth, upon which

the cities were built, and without which the country could not have been inhabited.—The *ſecond* great work of art in Egypt, was the Lake of Mæris;—a moſt uſeful work,—of wonderful circumference and depth.—The *third* great work of Egypt, was the Labyrinth.—The *fourth*, the Pyramids,—the *laſt* of the great works of Egypt, as Herodotus has arranged them, but ſuch, that, if they had not been ſtill extant, we could not have believed in the other wonders of Egypt.—The greateſt work of art among the Egyptians, was their Government,—the ſubject of which was *Men*, and not materials ſuch as ſtone and brick.—In this they exceeded all the world.—All theſe arts, joined with their prodigious numbers, and the arts and ſciences they invented, make them the moſt wonderful people on earth.—Of the preſent ſtate of Egypt,—wonderfully changed for the worſe,—firſt, as to the numbers of the people.—The antient Egyptian Race not to be found in Egypt:—So that the nation may be ſaid to be annihilated.—Inſtead of being the moſt fruitful country in the world, not able to maintain the few inhabitants that are in it: And, inſtead of being the healthieſt country in the world, it is now the ſeat of diſeaſe. Page 245

CHAP. XIII.

Recapitulation of what has been ſaid in the former chapter.—The ſubject of the origin of the arts and ſciences continued.—The art of government invented in Egypt, and brought to perfection.—Of the neceſſary arts of life there invented.—Language alſo will be ſhown to have been there invented.—The uſe of fire diſcovered in Egypt;—and the uſe of it in making glaſs, which was unknown to the Greeks and Romans.—Glaſs coloured like precious ſtones, alſo known to them;—likewiſe the hatching of chickens without incubation.—Of the art of muſic:—It was practiſed in Egypt for the beſt purpoſes:—As it was practiſed there, it was alſo there invented.—The practice of it very antient in Egypt.—It was invented under the Dæmon Kings,—and was preſerved with the greateſt care, and no innovation of it ſuffered.—For this purpoſe, there muſt have been a notation of it.—An art of muſic of very difficult invention, being the application of numbers to the tones of the human voice or of inſtruments,—a ſhort account given of the difficulty of the invention.—It could only have been invented in a country ſuch as Egypt, where arts and ſciences were cultivated.—The Greek muſic no better than the muſic of the Hurons, till Pythagoras brought the art into Greece from Egypt.—From thence they only got the Diatonic Scale.—To this they added the Chromatic and the Enharmonic.—This refinement of muſic not ſo proper for the uſeful purpoſes to which the Egyptians applied it.—The Greeks had alſo modes of muſic, ſuch as the Dorian, the Phrygian, and Lydian.—The writing art more connected with language than muſic.—It is language not pronounced.—A wonderful art, by which ſounds are made viſible,—a progreſs in the writing art as in every

every other.—At firſt, the ideas were directly repreſented, by figures natural or ſymbolical.—Theſe laſt were what is called Hieroglyphics.—Of the aſſiſtance given to our intellect by our ſenſes, and how wonderfully the two concur to carry on man in the purſuit of knowledge.—The advantages of the writing art.—This art invented in Egypt by a Dæmon, called Theuth.—But he invented only the notation of the elemental ſounds by written characters.—The analyſis of language, into elemental ſounds, was before his time, under the Dæmon Kings. Page 254

CHAP. XIV.

Of the difficulty of the invention of Language.—The forming of ideas, neceſſarily previous to the invention of Language; as there can be no Language, which has only names for individual things.—Of the difference betwixt Particular and General Ideas:—Abſtract and General Ideas not the ſame.—Of the material part of Language, Articulation;—of wonderful difficult invention.—Nature has furniſhed the materials, with which other arts work; but we have created the materials of Language.—Wonderful, that we ſhould have learned to articulate by any practice.—Speaking the moſt wonderful thing among Men.—As Men ſpeak by imitation, they muſt have been taught to ſpeak.—This could not be done by Men ſuch as we,—but they muſt have had ſupernatural aſſiſtance, and been taught by Dæmons.—A Language of Art could not have been formed without Men having made ſome progreſs in other Arts and Sciences.—This could not be without ſome kind of Language being uſed before a Language of Art was formed.—The formal part of Language, a moſt wonderful part of the Art.—There muſt be words in a Language of Art, to expreſs every thing in the World of Nature and the World of Art, Immaterial things as well as Material.—Each individual thing impoſſible to be expreſſed,—only the ſpecies of them can be expreſſed.—Theſe ſo many, that they could not be all expreſſed by words unconnected with one another.—But they are connected together by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.—Of theſe three, the greateſt Art is *Flection*.—An example of the Art of it in the Verb.—To a Language that is perfect is joined the pleaſant Art of Muſic, conſiſting of Melody and Rhythm.—This common to ſeveral of the Antient Languages, and to ſome Modern Languages.—Of the difference betwixt the Muſic of the Chineſe Language and that of the Greek.—The one is Chanting or Singing; the other of a fine Melodious flow, ſuitable to Language, and quite different from common Muſic.—Language thus ſhown to be a moſt beautiful as well as uſeful Art, and of the greateſt extent, variety, and, at the ſame time, regularity. p. 264

CHAP. XV.

Reaſons for the Author inſiſting ſo much upon the difficulty of the invention of the Art of Language.—One reaſon is, that it tends to prove, that Language muſt have been invented in Egypt, where ſo many other arts were invented.—Proved, 1*mo*, That Language was invented by the Egyptians, by the progreſs they made in other arts and in ſciences, which could not have been without Language.—2*dly*, Articulation could not have been invented without the aſſiſtance of thoſe Dæmon Kings, whom the Egyptians had.—3*tio*, We are ſure that the Egyptians made the firſt ſtep in the invention of an art of Language, by analyſing it into its elemental ſounds.—They did not ſtop at that analyſis, but likewiſe analyſed the words into the parts of ſpeech.—But theſe words at firſt monoſyllabical.—In this ſtate Language went to China, where it remains unimproved, in its original ſtate,—Hieroglyphics went there alſo;—and there they are ſtill preſerved.—In Egypt the art was perfected by the invention of the Alphabet, and of a Polyſyllabical Language, formed by Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.—This compleated the Grammatical Art, and the Art of Language.—The Phœnicians the only people that can contend with the Egyptians for the invention of Language.—Sundry reaſons given why they were not the inventors of it.—1*mo*, Their Genius did not lead them that way, being wholly employed in Trade, and ſtudious only of Gain.—2*dly*, They had no Polity fit for the invention or cultivation of arts.—3*tio*, They lived, in antient times, in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians, and ſo may be ſuppoſed to have got Language and other arts from them.—4*to*, They had their Religion from Egypt.—This proved by ſundry facts.—The Egyptians, therefore, the inventors, and the only inventors of Language.—How Language and other arts were tranſmitted from Egypt to other Countries, is an important part of the Hiſtory of Man:—This to be treated of in the following Book. Page 273

BOOK III.

Of the Tranſmiſſion of Arts and Sciences from Egypt to other Countries.

CHAP. I.

Egypt ſo ſituated as to be fit for communicating its Arts to many countries of the Earth.—It communicated by land with Africa and Aſia.—In Africa their Arts do not appear

pear to have made any great progreſs.—The Lybians quite a Savage People.—They ſpoke a very barbarous Language, which they may have formed from hearing the Egyptian Language ſpoken.—To Aſia the Egyptian Language and Arts may have been carried by Seſoſtris, who overran even the northern parts of Aſia, and eſtabliſhed a colony at Colchis upon the Euxine Sea.—The Jews learned their Language from Egypt,—but it was a corrupt dialect of the Egyptian which they ſpoke.—This proved from what paſſed in Egypt when Jacob and his family came there.—They learned alſo the writing Art in Egypt, and wrote like the Egyptians from right to left.—From Chaldæa the Egyptian Language proceeded to other parts of Aſia.—The Art of Language, though of more difficult invention than any other Art, is of very eaſy communication.—Of the progreſs of the Egyptian Arts from Egypt to Europe.—Seſoſtris, from Colchis, might have gone by land to Thrace, where he was.—But the eaſier and ſhorter paſſage from Egypt to Europe was by Sea.—Of Navigation the Egyptians had the uſe in the earlieſt times.—The neareſt Iſland in the Mediterranean Sea to Egypt was Crete.—Thither the Egyptian Arts firſt went, being introduced by the *Idæi Dactyle* and the *Curetes*.—That Religion came from Egypt to Crete, proved by the Samothracian and Eleuſinian Myſteries, being well known there.—Saturn the firſt King of Crete, being dethroned by his Son Jupiter, carried from thence the Egyptian Arts to Italy, and made a Saturnian age there.—Jupiter ruled in Greece as well as in Crete,—introduced there the Egyptian Arts.—Theſe Arts brought into Greece more directly by Colonies from Egypt.—The neceſſity of Migration from ſo ſmall a Country as Egypt, and ſo populous.—Of the two Colonies which came from Egypt, and formed the nations of Athenians and Arcadians:—Theſe the two moſt antient nations of Greece.—From Arcadia came a Colony under Oenotrus, that ſettled in Italy, and another under Evander.—From Arcadia came the Pelaſgi, who introduced a great deal of Civility and Arts into Greece, particularly the Writing Art:—But the Egyptians carried their Arts to a Country very remote, viz. India.—This the ſubject of another chapter. Page 280

CHAP. II.

The ſimilarity of Polity, Cuſtoms, and Manners, betwixt nations ſo remote as Egypt and India, wonderful, and without example,—not to be found even in nations contiguous.—The firſt reſemblance is, in a thing ſingular to both nations,—viz. the diviſion of the people into claſſes, according to their ſeveral occupations.—This diviſion in India, more accurate and minute than in Egypt.—Another ſingularity in which the two nations agree is, the veneration of the Cow.—Of the diviſion of Time into Months and Years;—the ſame in India as it was in Egypt, and is among us.—The diviſion into Weeks not neceſſary for any purpoſes of life, yet obſerved both in India and

and Egypt.—The days alſo conſecrated to the ſame planets and in the ſame order.—The conformity betwixt the two nations, as to the ſigns of the Zodiac, moſt extraordinary.—Of the Religion of India.—The ſame diſtinction made there, betwixt the Popular Religion of the country and the Religion of Philoſophers.—The fall of man maintained by the Indians, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments,—alſo the doctrine of the tranſmigration of minds, which came originally from Egypt.—The diet and manner of life of the Indians, the ſame as in antient Egypt.—They eat no fleſh, but of the beaſts which they ſacrifice.—They drink no wine or ſtrong liquors; and neither did the Egyptians in very antient times.—The ſame regard for the animal life in India as in Egypt.—The killing of ſome animals was a capital crime in Egypt, and is ſo in India.—There a mulct is impoſed for the killing of any animal, even Tygers.—A reſemblance betwixt the two nations alſo in their feſtivals, and exhibitions on thoſe occaſions. Page 288

CHAP. III.

The conformity in ſo many particulars, betwixt Egypt and India, could not have been by accident,—nor could each of theſe nations have been the original inventors.—The one muſt have copied from the other.—The queſtion then, Which was the original, which the copy?—No third nation, from which theſe two nations could have taken their inſtitutions and cuſtoms,—ſuch a conformity could not have been produced in the ordinary way of commerce.—The two nations, therefore, muſt have mixed and lived together for ſome time.—The Indians did not go to Egypt.—Therefore the Egyptians came to India.—This proved not by argument only, but by facts;—a particular account given by Diodorus of the expedition to India by Oſiris,—alſo of that of Seſoſtris to the ſame country.—Both theſe expeditions by land.—But Seſoſtris was not the firſt Egyptian King that went to India.—This atteſted not only by the ſacred books of the Egyptians, but by tradition preſerved among the moſt learned of the Indians.—In that tradition a memorable ſtory preſerved, of Oſiris having ſaved his army from a peſtilential diſeaſe by carrying it to a hill called Μηρος.—Hence the Greek fable.—Summary of the evidence of Oſiris having gone to India.—Objection to the account of Oſiris's expedition, that Herodotus ſays nothing of it.—This anſwered.—The tradition alſo mentions that Hercules was in India, and clothes and arms him very properly.—The abſurdity of the Greek fable, concerning the cloathing and armour of Hercules.—Memorials of Oſiris in India, to be ſeen in the days of Alexander, and even of Diodorus Siculus.—Strabo did not believe in the expedition of Oſiris.—A reaſon given for that.—The Egyptians could not go to India to learn civility and arts;—theſe they muſt have [illegible] fore,—and the Indians muſt have learned them from them.—This proved [illegible] black men, with woolly hair,

hair, to be ſeen in India; and alſo in China and Japan.—Proof that the Egyptian Religion, as well as arts, was carried to all the countries of the Eaſt as well as to India.—Language alſo carried from Egypt to India,—a language of art, the work of ſcience and philoſophy; in which analyſis is very much practiſed. Page 295

CHAP. IV.

The Egyptians muſt have had the uſe of a Language of Art before they could have invented ſo many Arts and Sciences, as it is proved they did invent.—This Language they muſt have invented themſelves, or got from ſome other country;—no other country but Egypt, where it could have been invented.—The Phœnicians could not have been the inventors of a Language of Art, for reaſons which are given.—The queſtion is, Whether Oſiris carried to India the Language of Egypt, as well as its other arts?—If the language of India were a barbarous language, it could not be ſuppoſed to have come from Egypt.—But the Shanſcrit, the original language of India, a language of the greateſt art.—This proved by the teſtimony of Sir William Jones, and of Braſſey Halhed.—It excels in the three great arts of Language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection, and particularly in the laſt.—In the pronunciation it has both Melody and Rhythm;—and its Poetry is formed by ſhort and long ſyllables:—A ſpecimen of that Poetry given by Braſſey Halhed.—In that ſpecimen, the words are of great length, and full of vowels.—Their alphabet conſiſts of 50 letters. The long and ſhort vowels marked by different characters.—The author learned more of the Shanſcrit language from Mr Wilkins than he has learned any other way. Mr Wilkins has proved by fact, what the author thought could only be proved by argument, that the Shanſcrit was the Egyptian language imported into India by Oſiris.—This proved by comparing the Greek with the Shanſcrit.—General reflections on the tranſmiſſion of languages from one country to another, and the changes thereby made in the languages.—And, *firſt*, as to the pronunciation.—That changes in the ſame nation; but much more when a language is carried to a different nation, and that nation at a great diſtance.—2*dly*, As to the ſenſe of the words.—This changed, too, by the language going to a different country.—Examples of derivative languages much changed from the original;—ſuch as the Italian, French, and Spaniſh, and the dialects of the Gothic.—Though theſe languages did not travel far, yet ſo changed as not to be intelligible, though one underſtands the parent language:—So different alſo from one another, that the underſtanding of one will not make you underſtand another.—The change muſt have been much greater in the antient Egyptian language, when it travelled as far as India, and was introduced among a people ſo barbarous as the Indians then were.—As it is ſpoken by the common people there, it is not to be known for the language of antient Egypt, but preſerved among the Bramins.

Bramins.—Another obſervation upon the paſſage of language from one country to another.—The pronunciation muſt be very much changed, particularly of the vowels; —alſo of the conſonants.—Words of the ſame ſound do not prove two languages to be the ſame,—not even if they be of the ſame ſenſe likewiſe, unleſs there be many of them, or words that muſt have been original in all languages.—A conformity betwixt two languages in the three great arts of Language, Compoſition, Derivation, and Flection, the ſureſt proof of their being originally the ſame language.—The names of numbers, and of members of the human body, and of relations, muſt be original words in all languages.—*1ſt*, Of the names of numbers.—Theſe in Shanſcrit the ſame as in Greek and Latin.—Some anomalies in theſe numbers of the Shanſcrit, and the ſame in Greek and Latin.—The names of the members of the human body the ſame in Shanſcrit as in Greek and Latin,—alſo the names of Relations.—The name of God in Shanſcrit, the ſame as in Greek and Latin,—many words of the Shanſcrit more Latin than Greek.—Inſtances of that.—A difference in the ſound of the words in Shanſcrit, and in Greek, and Latin.—This accounted for, from the great changes in the pronunciation of language.—Of Greek names of places and perſons in India, when Alexander was there,—theſe names more Greek than the preſent Shanſcrit.—The reaſon of this.—A great many more Greek words to be collected from the Shanſcrit.—Mr Wilkins has given the author about 70 more.—Other words he has got from other travellers in India.—Of the reſemblance of the two languages in the three great arts of Language, Compoſition, Derivation, and Flection. —Examples of compoſition in the Shanſcrit.—One extraordinary compoſition, with the *A privative*, as common in the Shanſcrit as in the Greek.—Of derivation in the Shanſcrit, Mr Wilkins has given the author no example,—but it is uſed in that language as well as compoſition and flection.—Of flection in the Shanſcrit.—The great variety of this art of language.—Verbs in μι in the Shanſcrit as well as in the Greek, —a ſpecimen of four perſons of the preſent tenſe of the ſubſtantive verb in the Shanſcrit, the ſame with the Greek and Latin.—Mr Wilkins, by comparing the two languages, has proved that in fact the two languages are the ſame,—has ſettled, in this way, a fact which was denied by ſome antient authors, that the Egyptians were in India.—The learned world thereby much obliged to him. Page 318

CHAP. V.

The Language imported by Oſiris into India is ſtill preſerved under the name of the Shanſcrit.—It is the Sacred Language of India; now underſtood only by the Bramins.—It is to be preſumed, that the Language of Egypt, as it went as far as India, went alſo to the neighbouring countries.—But, beſides preſumption, there is proof from facts.—This furniſhed by M. Gebelin in his *Monde Primitif*.—He, and Bullet in

in his Celtic Dictionary, maintain, that there was a primitive Language, from which all the other Languages on earth are derived.—That ſuch a Language did exiſt, M. Gebelin has proved, by comparing the ſeveral Languages in the world with one another,—the European, Aſiatic, and American, Languages compared together by him.—America peopled from the north eaſt parts of Aſia.—A curious fact related of a ſingular cuſtom of the Egyptians which the Americans have adopted.—The method which M. Gebelin has followed in making this compariſon, very proper, by finding out the radical words in the ſeveral Languages.—Of the difference of ſound of derivative words from their radicals in the ſame Language; but this difference much greater in different dialects of that Language.—An exact account, digeſted into tables, given by Gebelin, of the changes of derivative words from the original.—The change of vowels in the derivative Languages, not ſo great as of conſonants:—The reaſon for this.—But conſonants alſo changed.—This makes the difference ſo great betwixt the original and derivative Languages.—Of the monoſyllables of the Chineſe Language; many of them to be found in other Languages, and particularly in the Coptic.—Thus proved, that there was a time when there was only one Language on the face of the earth.—The author, before he read M. Gebelin, was of another opinion.—What that Language was M. Gebelin has not determined.—All the Languages of Europe, he ſays, are derived from the Celtic.—But the Celts did not invent their Language, nor the Goths theirs.—The Gothic a more perfect Language in ſome reſpect than the Latin.—Any nation ſpeaking a language of art, only proves that the original Language came to them in greater perfection than to other nations.—The reſemblance betwixt the Celtic and other Languages, no proof that theſe Languages are derived from the Celtic.—The Greek Language was certainly not derived from the Celtic, but came directly from Egypt.—If the Greeks did not invent their Language, how can we ſuppoſe that the Celts or Goths did.—The progreſs of the formation of the Language of art, in Egypt, muſt have begun with words of one ſyllable.—In that way the Chineſe monoſyllabic Language is to be accounted for.—Theſe monoſyllabical words were the roots of the primitive Language.—A great queſtion, By what rule, or whether by any rule, theſe roots were formed?—The letters, according to M. Gebelin, are to be conſidered as a kind of roots.—The Authors opinion in this matter:—Nothing, even among men, done without ſome reaſon.—Many words formed from the ſound.—Even ideas may be expreſſed by a ſound, which is ſuppoſed to have ſome analogy to them.—The Shanſcrit, according to Father Pons, a moſt wonderful piece of art and ſcience.—It analyſes the particular ideas, expreſſed by the words, into the general ideas from which they ariſe.—Theſe expreſſed by monoſyllables, which are the roots of the Language.—Monoſyllables being the ſimpleſt words are the fitteſt for Derivation and Compoſition.—From theſe roots, in long order and with great variety, are deduced, according to fixed and determinate

terminate rules, the words of the Shanſcrit, expreſſing the particular ideas, falling under the general ideas denoted by the roots.—Examples of this given by Pons the Jeſuit:—a knowledge of the roots, and of the Grammar of the Language, together with the rules of derivation and compoſition, will enable a perſon to form a Language of his own, which will be underſtood by thoſe who know the art by which the Language is formed.—The Jeſuit Pons's account, of this Language, confirmed by Mr Wilkins.—This Language the work of philoſophers.—It may be compared to the *Categories* of Archytas.—The Greek and Latin, though not ſo perfect as the Shanſcrit, wonderful works of art,—connecting, by means of Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection, ſome millions of words.—Flection the greateſt of theſe.—Its wonderful effects in nouns and verbs.—In the Greek verb upwards of a thouſand variations.—M. Gebelin, though learned in Languages, knew ſo little of the philoſophy of Language, as to maintain that men ſpeak naturally, and have from nature the ideas they expreſs by the words.—According to him, two perſons meeting, who had learned no Language, would hold communication together by ſpeech, and underſtand one another.—This the primitve Language of Gebelin:—According to him, all other arts, as well as Language, natural to men; and they have from the beginning the knowledge of aſtronomy, and of all the arts of life.—No natural ſtate according to Gebelin, the Savages, at preſent to be found, being men degenerated.—The Author's ſyſtem, from antient books, very different from Gebelin's;—though an admirer of Greek learning, and a reader of many books in that Language, M. Gebelin has not read their philoſophers, who would have taught him the progreſs of man from *capacity* to *energy*.—Without Greek philoſophy, no natural talents or application will avail.—Contradiction in Gebelin's ſyſtem;—it is refuted by the fact, of deaf perſons being likewiſe dumb, and being taught to ſpeak with great labour and much difficulty.—Even the moſt barbarous Language a work of art, if the words expreſs all the ideas of the ſpeaker, and are connected together.—Men, in the natural ſtate, without the uſe of ſpeech, are in the caſe of dumb men:—They could not teach themſelves:—But the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, who invented Language, muſt firſt have taught themſelves, and then others.—Progreſs of the art even in Egypt.—The firſt words there monoſyllables.—The Language in that ſtate went to China:—When a Language of words of ſeveral ſyllables was invented, theſe monoſyllables were made the roots of the Language.—In this way the Shanſcrit was formed.—But the Chineſe have preſerved the Language, in monoſyllables, as they got it.—The great imperfection of that Language.—The queſtion, In what country Gebelin's primitive Language was invented?—It could be no where but in Egypt, where the Dæmon Kings reigned.—The Jews had no Language revealed to them,—no country in ſuch a ſtate of civility, when Oſiris went to India, that they could have invented the moſt barbarous Language.—Of the way the Egyptian Language was communicated to other nations,

nations, and how it came to be ſo barbarous as it was ſpoken by ſome nations.—It was conveyed to India by Oſiris, and by him depoſited in the hands of the Bramins, who have preſerved it with little or no corruption, but have not improved it.—It alſo went to Greece, but not in ſo great purity as to India,—was preſerved there by Homer and the other poets.—Next to the Greek Language, it is in the greateſt purity in the Celtic.—This proved by its reſemblance to the Latin,—and by the name of *Shanſcrit* being a Celtic word.—Surpriſing that in ſome of the moſt barbarous Languages, a good deal of the art of the antient Egyptian Language ſhould be preſerved, —as in the Gothic;—even in the Language of Greenland there is a dual number.—How ſo many Languages, differing ſo much from one another, ſhould be all derived from one primitive Language, accounted for.—The variety made in the two Egyptian alphabets ſtill more wonderful.—Objection anſwered, that it was not conſiſtent with the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, to confine the invention of Language to one country.—That country ſufficient for the purpoſe.—The variety of the ſyſtem of nature did not admit that many countries ſhould be ſo well fitted for that purpoſe.—Objection, that all the people on earth have not learned the uſe of ſpeech, particularly the Ourang Outangs.—But they may ſtill learn it, as ſome wild people in Ethiopia have done. Page 333

CHAP. VI.

The hiſtory of Religion fitly ſubjoined to the hiſtory of arts and ſciences.—In what ſenſe Religion is natural to man:—It does not belong to him in his natural ſtate, nor even when he lives in herds,—but only in the civiliſed ſtate;—not even in the firſt ages of civility.—This proved both by the reaſon of the thing, and by three examples.—The knowledge of a God aroſe from man's ſtudying himſelf.—The progreſs of that ſtudy, and the reaſoning, by which men were convinced of the exiſtence of ſuch a Being.—As men formed the firſt idea of a God from themſelves, they naturally made him like themſelves, conſiſting both of body and mind, but both more excellent than theirs.—Egypt the country in which Religion had its origin, as well as arts and ſciences.—This proved both by the reaſon of the thing, and the authorities of authors.—Egypt having been governed ſo long by Dæmon Kings, there were two Religions there, a Philoſophical Religion, and a Religion for the vulgar. Religion went from Egypt to Greece;—alſo to India, where ſeveral monuments of the Religion of Egypt are to be ſeen at this day.—The idea of a God went to other countries as well as to Greece and India, though not the worſhip as practiſed in Egypt.—A plurality of Gods according to the firſt Religion among men;—but one principle among them, according to the Religion both of Egypt and Greece.—As thoſe antient Gods were ſuppoſed to have bodies, they had alſo ſenſes that were to

be gratified;—and their minds alſo were to be gained, in the ſame way as the minds of men, by things preſented to them.—The firſt things offered to the Gods were the fruits of the earth.—The memory of theſe offerings preſerved both in Egypt and Greece.—When men began to eat fleſh, animals were offered to the Gods.—This done ſo conſtantly when they killed animals, that to *kill* was ſaid to *ſacrifice*.—This enjoined in ſome nations as a duty,—particularly among the Jews.—The Gods, by thoſe ſacrifices, were ſuppoſed to have their ſmell gratified, and their ears pleaſed by the muſic accompanying the ſacrifice.—Their eyes alſo pleaſed by magnificent Temples, Altars, and Proceſſions.—In return for theſe offerings, it was expected that the Gods would give them ſucceſs in war and their other occupations;—and would reveal to them future events, which they ſuppoſed was done in many different ways.—Among the Jews, Moſes was obliged to eſtabliſh a Religion reſembling the Religion of the times:—They were incapable of receiving any other.—This the ſtate of Religion in the firſt ages of the world, before arts and ſciences had made any conſiderable progreſs.—But after arts and ſciences were improved, Religion wore a very different face.—All Arts, Sciences, and Philoſophy, came originally from Egypt.—From Egypt they went to Greece.—Of the great diſcoveries made by Philoſophy in Theology,—Of the Platonic Doctrine of the Trinity.—The firſt, ſecond, and third perſons of that Trinity explained.—An error ſhown in our Engliſh tranſlation, with reſpect to the ſecond perſon of the Trinity.—Of Plato's doctrine with reſpect to a ſtate of pre-exiſtence, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments.—The Religion of the Philoſophers of Egypt brought to Greece, and from Greece to Italy,—where it was much cultivated among the Romans.—The popular Religion of Egypt alſo came to Greece and Italy.—The opinions of the Philoſophers muſt have had an influence even upon the opinions of the world.—Of the ſtate of Religion at the time when our Saviour came to the Earth.—The underſtanding of men ſo much then improved, that they had formed the idea of Beings ſuperior to themſelves.—But their ideas of ſuch Beings very groſs.—By the advances made in Sciences and in Philoſophy, men were diſpoſed to receive a purer Religion when our Saviour came to the world.—The days of ignorance were then over, as St Paul has ſaid in his ſpeech to the Athenians.—An account given of that ſpeech.—It contains the ſyſtem of pure Theiſm, and gives a deſcription of the true God.—Of this God, even the vulgar, among the Athenians, appear at that time to have had ſome idea.—St Paul ſays nothing of the particular doctrines of Chriſtianity, except in one verſe, where he ſpeaks of the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt.—This laughed at by the Athenians,—though probably the Egyptians believed in the reſurrection of the body.—St Paul would explain to his Converts the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity, as 1*ſt*, The doctrine of the Trinity, of which an explanation is already given in this chapter.—2*dly*, The doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God,—of which an explanation is here given.—

3*dly*,

3*tio*, The incarnation, which is likewiſe here explained.—Another important doctrine of Chriſtianity is, that we muſt not believe that we can be happy in this life, but muſt look forward to the next.—This inculcated by our Saviour.—He has alſo provided for our happineſs in this life, if we will obey the laſt precept he gave his Diſciples, to love one another.—The Chriſtian Religion, more a Religion of Love than any other;—yet, by the abuſe of it, has produced more diſſentions among men, and more crimes than any other Religion.—Of the end of this World, and the reſtoration of things.—This a doctrine of Antient Philoſophy, with which the revelation by Jeſus Chriſt agrees.—According to it, that new World is not at a very great diſtance.—This proved in the ſequel of this work, by ſhowing that not only the minds and bodies of men are degenerated, but their numbers decreaſed.—Thus is proved that our Saviour came to the world in the fulneſs of time, when it was proper he ſhould come.—If he had come ſooner, and in the days of ignorance, his doctrine cauld not have been received.—This proved by the example of barbarous nations, who cannot be converted to the Chriſtian Religion;—and of the Jews themſelves.—The ſingular circumſtance of the Jews, that they are a nation without a country:—They are in all nations, and of no nation.—The worſt thing in the Heathen Religion was their ſacrifices.—Theſe muſt have been offenſive to the true God:—But that they ſhould be practiſed, was neceſſary among people who had not an underſtanding ſo cultivated, as to make them capable of underſtanding true Religion.--It was indulged even to the Jews.--The reaſon for this indulgence.--But after the coming of our Saviour, Sacrifices, Rites, and Ceremonies, were laid aſide, and a pure Religion eſtabliſhed,—but not all Rites were laid aſide, and particularly not Muſic.—Of the effects of Muſic in exciting Devotion.—It ought to be more practiſed by the Miſſionaries among the barbarous nations.—Of the preſent ſtate of Religion on this earth.—Chriſtianity the Religion of Europe,—alſo of Egypt, in the country about Alexandria.—There both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Sabbaths are obſerved.—In the Weſtern part of Aſia, Mahomediſm prevails;—in the Eaſtern, the popular Religion of Egypt which went to India.—The Philoſophical Religion alſo went there, as the Bramins believe in the Trinity,—Concluſion of the Hiſtory of Religion, Government, Arts, and Sciences.—Theſe three comprehend the Hiſtory of Man, as from them proceed all the operations of the intellect of man.—What is commonly called Hiſtory, is not what the Author calls a Hiſtory of man;—nor is it a matter of ſcience.

Page 363

Appendix. p. 403

PREFACE.

THE ſubject of this volume is the *Hiſtory of Man*, by which I mean, not what is commonly called Hiſtory, that is the Hiſtory of Nations and Empires, but the Hiſtory of the Species *Man*, a work of very great extent and variety; for man is not only diſtinguiſhed from the other animals of this earth, by being the nobleſt animal; but he is alſo the moſt various, not only in his compoſition, being, as the antients ſaid, a microcoſme or *little world*, containing the intellectual, the animal, and vegetable, life, but alſo by his having paſſed through a greater variety of ſtates than any other animal we know. It is, therefore, as I have ſaid, a work of ſuch extent and variety, that no author, ancient or modern, has ſo much as attempted it. Ariſtotle has written a moſt comprehenſive and moſt various work, which he entitles *the Hiſtory of Animals:* And it is a work of ſuch extent and variety, that if he had not educated the Conqueror of the world, I am perſuaded he never could have executed it; for it was, as we are told, by the information which Alexander procured him from different countries, that he was able to give an account of ſo very many different animals; ſeveral of which, I believe, are ſtill unknown to us, notwithſtanding the opportunity of information we have had by travellers, and by commerce. In this work Ariſtotle has given us what may be very properly called a Hiſtory of the Animals, of which he treats: For he not only has deſcribed their bodies and their animal economy, but he has given us what he calls their *manners*, that

that is, their affections and diſpoſitions. But as to *Man*, though he has mentioned ſeveral particulars concerning him, in which he agrees or differs from the brutes, he has given us nothing that can be called a hiſtory of the ſpecies. Nor does he any where, in this great work, give us any particular account of the ſeveral different ſtates through which man has paſſed, though, from the definition he has given of man*, it is evident he believed that he was not always the ſame animal that he now is. In modern times, I know only one work that can be called the hiſtory of any one ſpecies of animals, but which, the author has very modeſtly not entitled *the Hiſtory* of that animal, but only *Memoirs that may ſerve for compoſing ſuch a hiſtory*. The work I mean is that of a French author, Raumeur, who has given us an account of flies with four wings, under the title of *Memoires pour Servir a l'Hiſtoire des Mouches a quatre Ailes*. But the hiſtory of ſuch animals as flies, with *two* or *four wings*, or of even the moſt eminent animals of the brute kind, ſuch as elephants, horſes, lions, or tygers, is not to be compared with the *hiſtory of our own ſpecies*, being neither of ſuch curioſity, nor of ſuch importance for us to know.

It may be thought, that in a work of philoſophy, ſuch as this, I have beſtowed too much time upon hiſtory and facts. But it is impoſſible that the philoſophy of man can be underſtood without firſt knowing his hiſtory: Nor, without that knowledge, can any ſatisfactory account be given of the origin of evil; to account for which, is the chief deſign of this part of my work.

I will only further add, that, though I may not have had genius, learning, or leiſure, ſufficient to execute properly ſo great a work, the greateſt and nobleſt of the hiſtorical kind, and which lays the foundation of the philoſophy of man, and alſo is of great importance in theology,

* See what I have ſaid of that definition in the beginning of this volume.

theology, I hope I ſhall have at leaſt the merit of exciting others of greater abilities, and more leiſure, to undertake it; and if ſo, I ſhall have deſerved well of the learned world, and, I think I may add, of mankind.

As to the ſtile of this work, I have endeavoured to make it ſuch, as I think the ſtile of didactic writing ſhould be, that is, a ſtile by which the attention of the reader is not drawn from the ſubject neither by ornaments of words, ſuch as metaphors and epithets, which may amuſe the fancy, or tend to excite the paſſions of the reader, but are not conducive to the ſenſe or argument; nor by the compoſition, which ſhould not ſtudy to pleaſe the ear by the flow of periods, nor to attract the attention in a more diſagreeable way, by being harſh and abrupt, like the ſtile of Tacitus, and ſome of his modern imitators. What, therefore, ought to be chiefly ſtudied in didactic writing, is plainneſs and perſpicuity; the words being all the common words of the language, and the compoſition eaſy and natural. As to the ornaments of our proſe ſtile in Engliſh, a man who has ſtudied the ſtile of the beſt antient writers, and particularly the ſtile of Demoſthenes, as much as I have done, with the obſervations of the Halicarnaſſian upon that ſtile, and upon ſtile in general, muſt be convinced that it is impoſſible to ornament our Engliſh proſe ſtile, without making poetry of it, that is adorning it with Metaphors and Epithets; for the imperfection of our grammatical art is ſuch, as does not admit of that variety of arrangement of words, which is ſuch a beauty in the ancient compoſition, making not only the ſound of the language more various and more pleaſant to the ear, but giving a certain poſition to the words, ſuch as conveys the ſenſe more clearly and forcibly than the ſame words could otherwiſe do, as I think I have elſewhere ſhown * by

* See Diſſertation 3. annexed to vol. 2. of Origin of Language, and particularly p. 569. and following.

examples from Demoſthenes; whoſe language, for this reaſon, I think I underſtand better when I read him, or when he is well read to me, than what is written even in Engliſh. A man, however, may write very good orations; but he is no orator, unleſs he can pronounce them; for action, as Demoſthenes ſaid, is the firſt, the ſecond, and the third quality of an orator. Now, of action, I hold pronunciation to be the chief part*; for it is by it that the words and the ſenſe of them are conveyed to the hearers. The pronunciation of the Greek language was a thing of very great art, requiring not only a good natural voice, but alſo a muſical voice: For, in the Greek language, there was, as the Halicarnaſſian informs us, both melody and rhythm†; and, among other things he praiſes in the ſtile of Demoſthenes, he ſays, *That, when the ſubject requires it, his melody is magnificent and his rhythm dignified*‡. Such a pronunciation, accompanied with all the graces of action, muſt have made the orations of Demoſthenes, the nobleſt production of an art, the greateſt, as well as the moſt uſeful, among men; I mean the art of language, which, the Halicarnaſſian ſays, is the moſt *wonderful* §, though, at the ſame time, it be the moſt common of all arts; a propoſition which I have endeavoured to maintain through the whole of this work, and particularly in the 1ſt and 14th chapters of the ſecond book of this volume. Such ſpeeches, therefore, as thoſe of Demoſthenes, I do not wonder that people from all parts of Greece came to Athens to hear.

Having, therefore, as I have ſaid, formed my taſte of ſtile upon the compoſition of the antients, and particularly of Demoſthenes, I could

* See vol. 6. of Origin of Language, book 3. chap. 1. in the beginning.

† See what I have ſaid at great length upon both of theſe, in vol. 2. of the Origin of Language, book 2. chap. 4. and 5.

‡ His words are Τα Μελη εποιει μεγαλοπρεπη, και τους Ρυθμους αξιωματικους. Cap. 48. *De Admiranda vi dicendi in Demoſthene.*

§ Ibid. cap. 52.

could not have pleaſed myſelf, nor any of my readers of good taſte, if I had attempted, in a work of this kind, to make, with ſuch materials as the Engliſh language or any other modern language affords, what is commonly called *fine language;* and had not contented myſelf with expreſſing in plain words, and with a compoſition, which, at the ſame time that it is not obſcure, is not harſh or offenſive to the ear, my thoughts upon ſubjects, which I think of great importance, and ſuch as will certainly draw the attention of every ſenſible reader.

ERRATA.

Page	3.	line 20.	*for* endued *read* moved
	6.	14.	Ariſtotle's *read* in Ariſtotle's
	21.	11.	in Devonſhire *read* at Hull
	36.	22.	Mechior *read* Melchior
	40.	24.	execretion *read* execration
	46.	6.	whether *read* whither
	95.	23.	at once *read* once
	163.	11.	2000 *read* 1200
	315.	8.	And thus they arrived at the number *ten; read* Which made the number *nine.* And the next ſtep was to *ten;*
	328.	21.	muſt be an *read* can be no
	380.	21.	things *read* thing

INTRODUCTION.

ALL Philoſophy of every kind is the knowledge of Cauſes: But the Firſt Philoſophy, or Metaphyſics, as it is called by Ariſtotle, is the knowledge of the Firſt Cauſes, and the Firſt Cauſe of all, or the Cauſe of Cauſes, that is, Deity. This is the higheſt part of Metaphyſics, and which finiſhes the ſcience. It is called Theology; the ſubject of it being God, whom to know is the ſummit of knowledge, and the perfection of human nature. But we muſt begin with the works of God, by which only he is to be known: For, as we are told in Scripture, the inviſible things of God are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made *. In theſe works, it is the cauſes that we are chiefly to ſtudy; for it is through inferior cauſes that we are to aſcend to the knowledge of the Firſt Cauſe. The cauſes of every particular thing in this univerſe, or even on this earth, we cannot know or comprehend. Our knowledge, therefore,

* Paul's Epiſt. to the Romans, Chap. I. v. 20.

muſt be confined to thoſe that are moſt general. Theſe are of different kinds: And therefore a general diviſion of them was neceſſary; which Ariſtotle has given us into four kinds, the efficient, the material, the formal, and the final. And, if Ariſtotle had done no more in philoſophy than making this diſtinction of cauſes, I ſhould have thought he had done a great deal: For, philoſophy being the knowledge of cauſes, he may be ſaid, by his doctrine of cauſes, to have laid the very foundation of philoſophy, as I have elſewhere obſerved *. Before Ariſtotle, no philoſopher of Greece appears to have made this diſtinction accurately, but to have confounded all the four cauſes, and particularly the efficient and the material, which made the firſt philoſophy in Greece, before the philoſophy of Pythagoras was introduced by Plato and Ariſtotle, no better than downright materialiſm †. And ſome of the modern philoſophers, by endeavouring to account for the motions of body from a *vis inſita* in the body, or from ethers, fluids, and ſubtile ſpirits, have advanced doctrines which have a tendency to materialiſm: For, if bodies can in any way move themſelves, there is an end of the ſyſtem of theiſm ‡.

The firſt of the cauſes I have named is the Efficient, by whoſe operations every thing in the material world is produced. This cauſe is what I call *mind*; and I divide it into four kinds; for it is either the intellectual, the animal, the vegetable mind, or that mind which I call the elemental, and which is the principle of motion in all the bodies on this earth, not only the organized, ſuch as the animal and vegetable, but the unorganized, ſuch as the minerals. Theſe ſeveral minds I have been at great pains to diſtinguiſh from one another in different

* See Vol. II. of this Work, Book iv. Chap. 4. in the beginning.

† Preface to Vol. III. p. 12.

‡ Vol. II. Book iv. Chap. 3. in the beginning.

different parts of the three firſt volumes of this work, particularly in vol. I. p. 218; and the differences I have ſhortly recapitulated in the third volume, p. 20. Of the firſt kind of theſe minds is that Great Mind, from which all other minds, and all things in this univerſe, derive their origin; and, among other things, all other intelligences in the univerſe. The other three minds act by intelligence, but they have it not in themſelves; therefore, though they act for a certain end or purpoſe, it is without knowledge of that end, without conſciouſneſs, without intelligence, deliberation, or intention, and therefore neceſſarily *. Theſe three minds, thus acting without intelligence, conſtitute what the antient philoſophers call *Nature* †: And thus the antient philoſophers diſtinguiſhed God from *Nature*; two words that are in every body's mouth, but no body can diſtinguiſh them accurately who has not learned the antient philoſophy.

Of theſe three minds, the two firſt, viz. the animal and vegetable, our modern philoſophers acknowledge, and can diſtinguiſh from one another. But the third kind of mind appears to be utterly unknown to them: Yet they obſerve that bodies are moved, which are neither animals nor vegetables. This has led to two great errors: The firſt is, that body is endued by a *vis inſita*, a power eſſential to it; or, in other words, that body moves itſelf: And this is the error which Sir Iſaac Newton has fallen into in his *Principia*, and which, as I have ſhown elſewhere ‡, has a direct tendency to materialiſm, or what is the ſame thing, atheiſm; though, certainly, Sir Iſaac did not foreſee this conſequence of his doctrine, otherwiſe he never would have maintained it. The other error is, that God is the immediate author of all the motions of unorganized bodies, by which they are moved up or down, or in a ſtraight line: Now, if God be the im-

* Vol. I. p. 218.

† Ibid. See alſo Vol. II. p. 360.

‡ Vol. I. p. 531. 546. 554.—Vol. II. p. 319. 334. 341. 372.—Vol. III. Chap. I. of Appendix.

mediate cauſe of the movement of body, he muſt be incorporated with it; for we have no conception of mind moving body otherwiſe *: And if, in this way, he move unorganized bodies, there is no reaſon why he may not, in the ſame way, move organized bodies; ſo that theſe philoſophers may deny the exiſtence of the animal and vegetable minds as well as of the elemental, and make God the immediate author of all the motions in the univerſe: And, accordingly, this is the doctrine both of Spinoza and of Dr Prieſtley; and they carry it ſo far as to maintain, that God is the immediate author of our motions too; ſo that we have no mind in us any more than animals, vegetables, or unorganized bodies: And I think they argue more conſiſtently than Mr Baxter, who ſays that God is only the immediate author of the motions of unorganized bodies †.

It is to be obſerved that this mind, the principle of motion in unorganiſed bodies, is univerſal in nature, even in animals that have intellect, ſuch as man. And therefore, as it is a principle which goes through all nature, and is eſſential to all natural bodies, Ariſtotle calls it by the name of *Nature* ‡.

And

* See Vol. III. p. 326. and Vol. II. p. 47.

† See Vol. III. p. 8. and Vol. I. p. 207.

‡ See Vol. II. p. 46. and 51.; See alſo Vol. I. p. 85. 205. 230. and following, in which I have given a particular account of this kind of mind. And from the authorities there quoted, and particularly the authority of Proclus, quoted in p. 51. of Vol. II. it appears that the Platonic philoſophers conſidered it as the *anima mundi*, which pervaded all bodies, organized and unorganized, in ſhort the whole material world; and he further makes it the *Idea* of every thing, which gives life to the moſt lifeleſs thing, and makes things which would otherwiſe periſh, immortal: So that it is plainly the *Idea* of Timaeus, in his treatiſe *De Anima Mundi*, which joined with Matter, he ſays conſtitutes Body, that is, a ſubſtance which is apprehended by our ſenſes. And if we ſuppoſe it to proceed from a Divine Being, that being muſt be the

Third

And here we may obſerve how wonderful a compoſition the animal man is; for there are in him, beſides body, all the ſeveral minds I have mentioned, the intellectual, the animal, the vegetable, and the elemental, that is, every thing which is to be found in the great world: And therefore he is very properly called by the antients a Microcoſm, or *little world* *. And theſe four minds in man, I have no doubt, were the famous τετρακτυς of the Pythagoreans; which was thought ſo great a myſtery of philoſophy, that the Pythagoreans ſwore by him, who firſt diſcovered to them the τετρακτυς, '*Eternal ſource*,' as they ſaid, '*of ever-flowing nature* †.' And this may ſuffice, by way of recapitulation of what I have ſaid at great length in the two firſt volumes of this work concerning mind, the efficient cauſe of all things.

As to the Material cauſe, I have treated of it in the firſt chapter of the ſecond book of the firſt volume, where I have ſhown that the antients made a diſtinction, unknown in modern philoſophy, betwixt matter and body; for the antients abſtracted from body all its qualities, even its dimenſions, in the ſame manner as geometers abſtract from figures their ſurfaces and their lines; and even from a line its termination, which they call a point, and ſay that it has no dimenſions ‡. So that, however whimſical this abſtraction, made by antient metaphyſicians, of matter from body, may ſeem to be, it is not more whimſical than the abſtraction made by geometers of a point, or

Third Perſon of Plato's Trinity. And if, further, we ſuppoſe this Divine Principle to be the author, not only of the motion of all bodies, but of all the actions of intelligent beings, ſuch as man, then it may be held to be the Third Perſon of the Chriſtian Trinity.

* Vol. II. p. 136.

† Ibid. and Vol. III. p. 12.

‡ See Vol. I. p. 50. and 51.

or thing having no parts, from a line. But further, as it is admitted by all philoſophers, that all the bodies on this earth, however different in appearance, are reſolvable into four elemental bodies, earth, water, air, and fire, there appears to be nothing in the nature of things to hinder theſe four from being reſolved into one matter common to them all. And if it be true, as I believe it is, that thoſe elements change into one another, there muſt neceſſarily be in them ſome common matter, which, by aſſuming different forms, becomes fire, air, earth, or water *.

As to the Formal cauſe, it is explained at great length in Archytas the Pythagorean's work, περι του παντος, the ſubject of which is, *univerſal forms*, as I call them, (for *generals* are the ſubject of all ſciences, but *univerſals* are the proper ſubject of metaphyſics), and Ariſtotle's book of Categories, where we have all the different cauſes of that kind enumerated and reduced to the number of 10. It is perhaps the greateſt work of ſcience that ever was compoſed; and indeed it is the foundation of all ſcience, ſince, without it, there cannot be any complete definition †. It is ſuch a diſcovery as, I think, could not have been made by any ſingle man, but only by ſocieties of men, ſuch as the Egyptian prieſts, who had been cultivating ſciences for thouſands of years. Though it treats only of the forms of things, yet, as theſe are ſo infinitely various, and belong to every thing in heaven or earth, making an eſſential part of the ſyſtem of the univerſe, they are a very proper ſubject of univerſal philoſophy or metaphyſics. And accordingly, Archytas has very properly entitled his work, *Of the whole of things*. And Ariſtotle, though he has made his book of Categories a part of his Logic, and the firſt part, for which, I think, there was a very good reaſon, he has likewiſe treated of them in his Metaphyſics.

The

* See Vol. I. p. 48.

† Ibid. p. 317.

The only other cauſe I mentioned is the Final cauſe, which, though it be commonly ranked by the interpreters of Ariſtotle as the laſt cauſe *, is in reality the firſt and the principal; for it is for the ſake of the end that the efficient cauſe acts, the form is given to the thing, and matter provided to receive that form: It belongs to intelligent beings, and to them only; for it is only for an end propoſed that intellect acts. It is, however, very little conſidered by our modern philoſophers, though, I think, it ought to be the chief ſtudy of all philoſophy, and eſpecially by thoſe who carry their ſpeculations up to the firſt Cauſe, the Author of the univerſe; for we cannot ſufficiently admire his wiſdom and goodneſs, unleſs we know the final cauſes of things. I will ſay no more of it here, as I have treated pretty fully of it, and of cauſes in general, in chap. 4. of book 4. of vol. 2. of this work; alſo in vol. 1. book 1. chap. 4. p. 33.

In our little world, as well as in the great, there are all the four cauſes, as well as the four minds I have mentioned: So that in man there are not only all the active principles or minds which form the univerſe, but all the cauſes which conſtitute it, and make it what it is after it is formed. Of all theſe principles and cauſes, I have treated at conſiderable length in my firſt and ſecond volumes; where, beſides what I have ſaid of mind, I have explained the nature of Motion, Energy, Action, Paſſion, Power, Habit, Faculty, Matter, and Form †: And, in vol. 1. book 4. I have treated of what I call the adjuncts of Nature, Time, Space, and Place.

Of the third volume, which I have prefaced with the hiſtory of antient philoſophy, the ſubject is that moſt wonderful compound—*man*; of whoſe compoſition intellect is part. And, as there is no other

* See Vol. II. p. 214.

† See Vol. I. p. 46.

other intellectual being on this earth, it is only by the ſtudy of him that we can aſcend to the knowledge of ſupreme intelligence. It is therefore, as I have ſaid *, not to be wondered at that the ſeven wiſe men of Greece, when they joined all their wits together, could produce no greater or better fruit of their wiſdom, than what they preſented to their God, and inſcribed on his temple at Delphi; I mean, the precept, *Know thyſelf* †, a precept not only of the greateſt utility in the practice of life, but which leads up to the higheſt knowledge of which man is capable, and may be truly ſaid to be the fountain of all knowledge, divine and human.

But though, in this third volume, I have examined the different parts of the human compoſition, and diſtinguiſhed them, I think, accurately from one another, it is chiefly the animal part of our nature that I have conſidered. And I have been at pains to ſhow how much he is changed from what he was in antient times, in health, ſtrength, and ſize of body, and as the mind is ſo intimately connected with the body, that the mind alſo is degenerated in theſe later times. I have alſo ſpoken, in the third volume, of the natural ſtate of *man*; and I will venture to ſay, that there are collected in that volume more facts concerning man in that ſtate, or near to that ſtate, than are to be found in any one book; and as what is called philoſophy in this age, is chiefly converſant about facts of natural hiſtory, one ſhould think that we ſhould at leaſt be as curious about the natural hiſtory of our own ſpecies as about the natural hiſtory of other animals, even ſome of the loweſt rank, ſuch as worms and flies, upon which volumes have been written. In this fourth volume I propoſe to ſay a great deal more upon the natural hiſtory of man, and to trace his progreſs from the natural ſtate to

* See Vol. II. p. 90.

† γνωθι σεαυτον. Plato's Protagoras, p. 243. edit. Serrani.

to the ſtate of the higheſt civilization. And this will be the ſubject of the firſt book of this volume, which may be called the *Hiſtory of Man.* The ſubject of the ſecond book will be the *Philoſophy of Man:* And the third book will conclude the Science of Metaphyſics with *Theology.*

ANTIENT METAPHYSICS.

BOOK I.

THE HISTORY OF MAN.

CHAP. I.

Of the difficulty of defining Man.—*This difficulty ariſes from its being neceſſary to define what he is by Nature.—Ariſtotle the only author who has defined Man.—His definition explained, and the full definition given tranſlated into Engliſh.—All the operations of the Human Mind, the animal as well as the intellectual, proceed from Compariſon.—The wonderful chain of things in Nature, to be ſeen in the progreſs of the Human Mind.—This definition of Man not intelligible to thoſe who have ſtudied only the Philoſophy of Mr Locke.—The author's apology for pretending to teach a better philoſophy than any that has been invented in modern times.—The propriety of defining Man by his comparative faculty and the capacity of intellect and ſcience.—Nothing ſaid of the Body of Man in the definition;—nor has Ariſtotle any where elſe ſaid that he is*

by nature erect.—The contrary is now found to be the caſe.—The facts by which this is proved.—The wonderful progreſs of Man, from a quadruped to ſuch an animal as he now is.—Of the world of art which he has created,—and made all the Powers of Nature ſubſervient to him.

WHAT is *Man*, is a queſtion which I believe no perſon can anſwer who has not ſtudied the antient Philoſophy. What makes the difficulty of anſwering it, is, that the definition of every animal muſt inform us what the animal is by Nature, independent of Art, that is, of any quality he may have acquired by teaching, or by obſervation and experience: For if, by natural inſtinct, he practiſes any thing which has the appearance of art, being done by rule and meaſure, it may very properly be made part of the definition of ſuch an animal. For example, the bee may very properly be defined an animal that makes honey, and lays it up in hexagon cells; but as to man, I believe there is no body who ſuppoſes that he practiſes all thoſe wonderful arts, which we ſee him practiſe, by mere natural inſtinct, without teaching, obſervation, or experience, unleſs he believe, as ſome men do, that man ſpeaks by nature: For if, in that way, he can practiſe the art of more difficult invention than any other, and of practice too ſo difficult, that if we were not in the conſtant uſe of it from our early infancy, we could have no uſe of it at all, he may practiſe every other art by nature. The queſtion then is, What is Man by nature, without any of the arts or ſciences which he has invented? Now this queſtion Ariſtotle, and Ariſtotle only, has anſwered; for he has defined man to be ζωον λογικον, θνητον, νου και επιστημης δεκτικον. What is meant by ζωον, or *animal*, which Ariſtotle makes the genus of this definition, is well known to be a being which perceives by ſenſes; but there is more difficulty to know what he means by the ſpecific difference

difference of λογικον, by which a man not learned in the antient Philoſophy, and not able to make the diſtinction between λογος and νους, will ſuppoſe that he meant what we call *rational*. But it is evident, from what follows, that Ariſtotle did not underſtand that Man was by nature a *rational* animal, as we underſtand the word. To know what λογικον means, we muſt know what is meant by λογος. Now λογος, in its proper ſignification, and as it is uſed by Euclid, who uſes no word in a metaphorical ſenſe, denotes a certain relation betwixt things, ſuch as numbers and figures *, and which we expreſs in Engliſh by the word *ratio*. Now, it is by compariſon that we diſcover the relation of things to one another, and therefore λογικος denotes what has the faculty of making this compariſon, according to the ordinary derivation of Greek words.

Man, therefore, according to Ariſtotle, is not only ſenſitive, as all animals are, but he has the faculty of comparing his ſenſations: And in this way he is diſtinguiſhed from the loweſt claſs of animals, ſuch as moths, and worms and other reptiles, and thoſe imperfect animals called Zoophytes, ſome of which, like vegetables, do not move from one place to another †. Theſe do not appear to have that comparative faculty; but man is ranked, by Ariſtotle, with the higher ſpecieſes of brutes, ſuch as horſes and dogs, who certainly have that comparative faculty; for they diſtinguiſh one kind of food from another, and of the different objects, which they perceive by their ſenſes, they chooſe what ſuits them beſt. Any man, accuſtomed to ride, will obſerve, that his horſe, when left to himſelf, chooſes that part of the road which is ſmooth and not deep, in preference to that which is ſtony or deep. Now, he could not give that preference without comparing the two. And the brutes form what we may call

a

* See Vol. I. of Origin of Lang. p. 31. and p. 338.

† Ariſtoteles de Hiſtoria Animalium, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 193. edit. Du Vall.

a reſolution, by which their natural inſtinct directs them to do one thing rather than another; and we ſee them very often deliberating, when their natural appetites draw them different ways. Thus I have ſeen a dog deliberate moſt anxiouſly, and debate with himſelf, when his love for his maſter prompted him to follow him through a rapid river, while the fear of the water reſtrained him. Ariſtotle adds next in the definition, what needs no explanation, that he is *mortal*.

Thus far Ariſtotle has exalted our nature, ſo as to be ranked with the better kinds of brutes; but he has not yet told us what diſtinguiſhes man from them even in his natural ſtate. But now he gives us that diſtinction, and very properly concludes his definition with it: For he ſays "That man is an animal, capable of intellect, "(or to tranſlate the Greek word literally), that may receive intellect, "and alſo of ſcience." And here the reader will obſerve, that I tranſlate the Greek word *νους*, not by the Engliſh word *reaſon*, as is commonly done, but by the word *intellect*, by which I mean to denote that faculty of the mind which forms ideas, and ſees the *one* in the *many*; whereas Reaſon, according to the Engliſh ſenſe of the word, denotes that faculty by which we compare our ideas, and form the laſt thing mentioned by Ariſtotle in this definition, viz. Science, which is formed by the diſcurſive faculty of the human mind, in Greek *διανοια*.

The full definition, therefore, of Man, according to Ariſtotle, is, "That he is a Comparative Animal, (that is, an animal, who has the "faculty of Comparing), who has alſo the capacity of acquiring In-"tellect and Science, and who is Mortal."

And here we may obſerve how properly Ariſtotle has ſet at the head of his definition of Man this Comparative faculty, as from it every

every operation of the human mind, animal as well as intellectual, is to be derived. And firſt, he compares corporeal objects, or the objects of ſenſe, with which all our knowledge in this life muſt begin; and by that compariſon he diſcovers that ſome of them are more fit for the purpoſes of animal life than others, and to theſe gives the preference, being directed either by his ſenſes, to which ſome of them are more agreeable than others, or by inſtinct, which prompts him as well as other animals to chooſe what is fitteſt for the preſervation of the individual, and the continuation of the kind.

The next act I ſhall mention of this comparative faculty, and which is alſo common to him with the Brute, is that by which he diſcovers that the ſeveral qualities, he perceives by his ſenſes in any particular object, are joined together in one object. This is an union which, as Proclus, *ad Timaeum*, p. 76. has very well obſerved, is not diſcovered by the ſenſes, which only report each its own perception. It is therefore diſcovered by the λογος, or comparative faculty, which is common to us with the brute. Another exerciſe of that faculty is that, by which he diſcovers an object to be the ſame with that which he had ſeen before. This he does, by comparing the object, when he ſees it a ſecond time, with the picture of it which he had retained in his Phantaſia after ſeeing it the firſt time. And farther, when he ſees an object of the ſame kind, having all or moſt of thoſe marks which his ſenſes had perceived in the firſt object, he knows it to be of the ſame kind. And this faculty of compariſon the brute likewiſe has; for it is by it that he diſtinguiſhes animals of his own ſpecies from thoſe of another, or animals of different ſpecieſes from one another, as a man from a horſe, or a horſe from an ox.

From

From this compariſon naturally ariſes another compariſon, but which it does not appear that the brute makes, ſo that here the road parts betwixt man and brute. By this compariſon, which is of the thing with itſelf, man, when he begins to have the uſe of intellect, and to form ideas, diſcovers that there are certain qualities in the thing, which are principal, and diſtinguiſh it more from other things than its other qualities. For example, he diſcovers in a horſe that he has a long body, long legs, an elevated neck, a head and tail of a particular form; and that he is ſwifter of foot, and, when he lays himſelf out, covers more ground, than other animals. From theſe principal qualities he ſeparates other qualities, which are common to him with other animals, ſuch as that of colour, or having four feet; and thus he forms the particular idea of a horſe: And the forming in this way the ideas of particular things, is the firſt operation of the human intellect, without which we could have no general ideas, as a general idea is nothing elſe but the particular idea generalized *. When we are further advanced in arts, ſciences, and philoſophy, we diſcover what is unknown to our modern philoſophers, that the particular idea of any thing is a mind or immaterial ſubſtance, which animates the thing, gives it motion and all its qualities, and makes it what it is, diſtinct from every thing elſe †. And here we may obſerve, that this compariſon of the object with itſelf is nothing more than making more accurate and more particular that compariſon, by which the brutes as well as we diſcover that other animals are of the ſame ſpecies with themſelves, and by which they alſo diſtinguiſh different ſpecieſes. The reader will alſo obſerve, that here we uſe

* See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject in Vol. II. of this Work, Book II. Chap. II. p. 76. and 85. The whole chapter is worth reading by thoſe who deſire to know accurately the difference betwixt ſenſations and ideas.

† Ibid. p. 73, 74, and 75.

uſe the faculty of abſtraction and ſeparation, which is peculiar to the intellectual nature, and without which we never could have formed ideas of any kind. For in this material world, as ſome of the antient philoſophers have obſerved, particularly Anaxagoras, as I remember, all things are ſo mixt with all things, that unleſs we can make that ſeparation and diſcrimination, which is made by abſtraction, we cannot have any diſtinct notion of any thing, but muſt perceive all things, together with all their qualities, as the brutes perceive them. Now even abſtraction cannot be without compariſon; for we muſt compare the thing we abſtract with that from which we abſtract it. Another thing to be obſerved is, that in forming the particular idea, as well as the general, we diſcover the *one* in the *many*; for we diſcover that there is one thing, or a certain determinate number of things, which make the objects, that we perceive by our ſenſes, what they are and nothing elſe. Here, too, there is compariſon; for we muſt compare the *one* with the *many*, by which compariſon we diſcover that the *one* contains the *many*.

The next ſtep in this progreſſion, and by which we are ſtill more diſtinguiſhed from the brute than by the former, is that by which we diſcover that the *one*, which we have found in one individual, is to be found in *many*. And thus we form the idea of a ſpecies, then of a genus, and ſo on till we aſcend to the higheſt genuſes, explained by Ariſtotle in his Categories. And in this progreſſion we may obſerve, that we ſtill uſe thoſe two great inſtruments of human knowledge, Generalization and Abſtraction; for we muſt both generalize the ſpecies, and abſtract from it the ſpecific differences, in order to form the idea of the genus; and both theſe operations, as I have ſaid, cannot be without compariſon. In this manner we form ideas ſuperior and ſubordinate.

The next ſtep in the human progreſſion is *Propoſitions*, in forming which we muſt neceſſarily compare the two ideas that we join together in the propoſition: And by that compariſon we diſcover that the one is either a part of the other, or not a part but excluded from it; for the truth of all propoſitions, poſitive or negative, is the reſult of that compariſon. Some of theſe relations of ideas we diſcover intuitively, and ſuch propoſitions we call Axioms. But of other ideas we diſcover the relation by a proceſs we call Reaſoning or Syllogiſm; but which ſtill goes on by comparing the ideas with one another. Thus I think I have ſhewn, that both intellect and ſcience are derived from that faculty of Compariſon, which Ariſtotle has made the firſt thing in the Definition of Man; and which, by our having the capacity to carry it further than the brute, makes us Intelligent and Scientific Creatures. 2*dly*, It appears that the definition, which Plato has given us of the operation of the mind when it forms ideas that is, making *one* of the *many*, is perfectly juſt, and applies not only to ideas, but to all the operations of the intellect in forming arts and ſciences. And, *laſtly*, from the account I have given of the progreſs of the human mind, what I have elſewhere ſaid * is evident, that in this ſtate of our exiſtence we know not the eſſence of any thing. What we know is only the relations of things to one another: For example, that one thing is the genus or ſpecies of another; that there are certain differences which diſtinguiſh the ſpecies from the genus; that there are properties of things which are peculiar to them, and others that are accidental. What we know, therefore, is all in ſyſtem, which is conſtituted by the relations and connections of things to one another. And thus, by aſcending from leſſer to greater ſyſtems, we may come at length to the contemplation of the ſyſtem of the univerſe and its great Author, which, to the intellectual mind, is the beatific viſion. And here we may obſerve the order and regularity

* Vol. I. of this work, p. 56.

regularity of that ſyſtem, by which man is connected with the brute, and how he begins where the brute ends, that is, with comparing an object of ſenſe with itſelf, ſo as to diſcover what is principal and predominant in it: So that there is here, as well as in other parts of natnre, a chain where no link is wanting, and where every thing is connected with every thing.

What I have here ſaid, I know, will not be intelligible to thoſe who have ſtudied only Mr Locke's Philoſophy, and conſequently have not learned to diſtinguiſh betwixt Ideas and Senſations, and know nothing of the *one* in the *many*, which, according to Antient Philoſophy, is the foundation of all the operations of the human intellect; and I can tell thoſe gentlemen farther, that they never will underſtand this, nor any other part of Antient Philoſophy, till they give up all they have learned in modern books of philoſophy, and have come to know that they know nothing of philoſophy: For, as I have obſerved elſewhere *, *to know that we do not know*, is the foundation of all human knowledge. Now this is ſuch a ſacrifice of a man's vanity, as we are to expect very few will make; and indeed to do ſo requires a candour and a love of truth and knowledge very rarely to be met with in this age: But even men of the greateſt candour and modeſty might be offended, if I pretended to have invented a philoſophy ſo much better than what this age or modern times have produced.—But that is not the caſe: I pretend to have invented no philoſophy, I only mean to reſtore the philoſophy of men much ſuperior to us, I mean the antient Egyptians and Greeks, who, if they had been inferior to us in genius and natural parts, cultivated philoſophy ſo much more than ever it was cultivated any where elſe, that they muſt have excelled us in it,

* Origin and Progreſs of Language, Vol. V. p. 296.

and which philoſophy was, for two centuries after the reſtoration of letters, the only philoſophy of Europe.—But to return to the *Man* of Ariſtotle.

He has defined him to be "A creature of Intellect and Science *only in capacity*," marking in this way the progreſs of man, as well as of every thing elſe on this earth, from capacity to actuality; for every thing here has firſt the capacity of becoming ſomething, before it is actually that thing: And it is from this grand and comprehenſive view of nature that Ariſtotle has given us that fine definition of motion, the great agent in all natural operations, which I have elſewhere explained *. How much longer the progreſs in man is, from mere capacity to the completion of his nature, than of any other animal, I ſhall preſently obſerve.

As Ariſtotle thinks the mind is principal in all animals, he has defined man by his mind only, and ſaid nothing of his body in the definition, nor any where elſe, as far as I can recollect, except in his Hiſtory of Animals, where he has told us, that man is more fitted by nature to be a biped than any other animal. But from thence I infer, that he did not think that he was by nature a biped †: For if he had thought ſo, he would not have ſaid that man was fitted by nature to be a biped more than any other animal; that is, as I underſtand the words, he could become a biped more eaſily than any other animal; but he would have ſaid plainly and ſhortly, that he was by nature a biped. But if he had ſaid ſo, he would have been miſtaken; for it now appears to be certain, that man is by nature a quadruped. This I have proved ‡, by ſundry inſtances of ſavages that have been caught

* Vol. I. of this work, Book I. Chap. III. p. 19.

† Vol. I. of Origin and Progreſs of Language, p. 186. of ſecond edition.

‡ Ibidem.

caught in different parts of Europe, going upon all four. One of them was well known in England, under the name of Peter the Wild Boy; for he was caught in the woods of Hanover not many years ago, and brought to England, where I ſaw him *. And there is another very remarkable inſtance, which I have mentioned in the third volume of this work †, of a quadruped of the human ſpecies that was found in the woods of Saxony. And I have lately diſcovered that there were found in Devonſhire two children, a boy that appeared to be about ten years of age, and a girl of twelve, going upon all four with ſurpriſing celerity. This I learnt from a newſpaper that was publiſhed in Devonſhire, of which I have given the words in the note below ‡. But beſides theſe inſtances of ſingle ſavages walking that way, I have mentioned, in the paſſage from the Origin and Progreſs of Language, above quoted, two nations, namely the Hottentots and Carribbees, where the children walk ſo long upon all four, that they are taught with much difficulty to walk upright.

Theſe examples prove, I think, beyond doubt, that the natural motion of man is upon *all four*. They are not very many in number;

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 57. and alſo p. 368.

† Ibid. p. 74.

‡ " *A Fact.*—There are at preſent two children at Cruwyt in Devonſhire, who " have been ſuffered, by their mother, to run wild from their infancy rather than " accept of the pariſh aſſiſtance. The one is a boy of ten, the other a girl of twelve " years of age. They are both in a ſtate of nature, feeding only on wild berries, " and running on *all fours* with amazing celerity. If purſued, they utter a terrific " ſcream, and hide themſelves on the top of a hill, or in the receſſes of a thicket " They are never ſeen in a ſtanding poſture; nor can they be prevailed on to ap- " proach any perſon but their mother, with whom, though they cannot ſpeak, they " have always kept up a diſtant and fearful communication." What is become of theſe children, or whether they be yet exiſting, I cannot tell, though I have ordered an inquiry to be made.

ber; nor is it poſſible that ſuch a fact in natural hiſtory ſhould be proved by induction of many examples. And indeed I think it is ſurpriſing that ſo many ſhould have been found in a civilized country, ſuch as Europe, where it is impoſſible that any individuals ſhould have been found in this ſtate, except ſuch as, by ſome accident, were expoſed when they were infants. But if there were any doubt in the matter, the way of walking of our own infants, upon all four, ſhould convince us that it is the natural motion of man. And I am perſuaded, that if we were not at pains to give them the erect poſture very early, they would continue to walk upon all four as long as the children of the Hottentots and Carribbees do; and if they were allowed to run wild as long as the Saxon ſavage did, they would be erected with as much difficulty as he was, to whoſe ſhoulders they were obliged to hang weights, to counteract that natural propenſity he had to fall prone; and which would be as ſtrong in our children, if by cuſtom, from their earlieſt infancy, it were not counteracted.

Now, from a quadruped, and a creature only capable of intellect and ſcience, what a wonderful progreſs to man in his preſent ſtate. And firſt, as to body, what a difference betwixt ſuch an animal, and the noble, erect, ſtately figures of the heroic age, or even of ſuch men as we are: And as to the mind, what compariſon can there be betwixt a mind void of all ideas, and the minds of the Egyptian prieſts, or the ſages of Greece, replete with ſcience and philoſophy. Then what a number of arts of neceſſity, eaſe, pleaſure, and elegance have been invented by this quadruped, more than I believe have yet been numbered. In ſhort he has made a world of art, to which nothing we know can be compared, except the great world of nature, the work of Infinite Wiſdom and Power. In forming this world of art, he has uſed all the materials which the natural world afforded him, and has ranſacked the animal, vegetable, and mineral

mineral kingdoms; and, not content with what he found above ground, he has dug into the bowels of the earth, and and from thence produced metals. But theſe could have been of little uſe to him. if he had not brought down from heaven fire, as it is ſaid, but which he now ſtrikes out of flints, a diſcovery that the Chineſe have not yet made. Of the vegetable he makes food, and feuel for fire, and many other uſes; and as to animals, it is ſurpriſing what a dominion he has obtained over them. The fierceſt and ſtrongeſt of them he has been able to reſiſt and conquer; others he has tamed and ſubdued, and made uſeful to him, even ſome of them of the largeſt ſize, ſuch as the elephant; others of them he has domeſticated, and made companions of them, and guardians of his houſe, and others of them he uſes for food. Nor is his dominion confined to the land; he reigns over the ſea, and makes it ſubſervient to him, not only in furniſhing moſt delicate food, but in wafting him to the moſt diſtant countries, and bringing from thence all the good things of thoſe countries which he by that means enjoys. The Leviathan,

——————————whom God
Created hugeſt that ſwim the Ocean ſtream *,

he has been able to conquer and kill, in his own element, and make uſeful for the purpoſes of life; and modern art has ſhewn upon the ſea a machine of enormous ſize, vomiting fire and ſmoke with the noiſe of thunder, and ſending death and deſtruction to an amazing diſtance: And this ſo prodigious machine is governed by little men ſuch as we, and made to ride triumphant over the waves. In ſhort, ſuch is this wonderful world of art, that not only thoſe ſtupendous productions of it I have mentioned, but even the meaneſt domeſtic utenſil, aſtoniſhes the philoſopher who knows from what fource it comes.

Now,

* Milton.

Now this wonderful progreſs of man, ſo much more wonderful than that of any other animal, Ariſtotle knew: For he has told us, that in his natural ſtate he has not the uſe of intellect, but only the capacity of acquiring it. Now it is by intellect that all the world of art has been produced, and man made ſuch as we ſee him. And indeed if we could ſuppoſe, as many do, that ſuch a natural ſtate of man, as I have deſcribed, never exiſted, then Ariſtotle would have defined a mere nonentity, a creature that neither is, nor ever was. But that is not the caſe; and he has not only properly defined man, but in his definition given a kind of hiſtory of the ſpecies, carrying it on from the firſt beginning of it, to its completion and perfection in intellect and ſcience: And, in my opinion, there never was a better definition given of any thing.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the ſeveral ſteps of the human progreſſion from the Brute to the Man.—The Author has ſeen three ſtages of that progreſſion;—firſt, *Peter the Wild Boy;*—ſecondly, *The Ourang Outang, of whom the Author has diſcovered ſome facts, ſince he publiſhed upon the ſubject;* —thirdly, *The Wild Girl in France.—She was an amphibious animal.—Several particulars concerning her mentioned.*

THE ſubject of this chapter will be to mark ſome of the firſt ſteps of this wonderful progreſſion of man. Of theſe I have ſeen with mine own eyes three, which I believe is what very few now living can ſay. The firſt I ſaw, was in the pure natural ſtate when he was catched in the woods of Hanover, walking on all four. It was Peter the Wild Boy, as he was called, whom I have mentioned above *. I ſaw him twice, and I had a very particular account of him from an Oxford gentleman, who, at my deſire, went to ſee him; which account I have publiſhed †. He had learned to articulate but few words, though he was put to ſchool, and no doubt a great deal of pains beſtowed to teach him to ſpeak. But this we ſhould not wonder at, when we conſider what trouble it requires to teach deaf men to ſpeak, though born and brought up among us. Of his being a man, there never was the leaſt doubt entertained; and that he was not an ideot, or defective in natural ca-

* Page 21.

† Vol. III. p. 368. See alſo p. 58. of the ſame volume, where I have given the accounts of him that were publiſhed in the newſpapers, immediately after he was brought to England.

pacity, I think is evident from the ſeveral accounts of him which I have publiſhed in the paſſages above quoted. And indeed, from what I ſaw of him myſelf, I think I can atteſt, that he had as much underſtanding as could be expected in a man who had learned none of our arts, not even the uſe of his own body ſo as to walk erect, till he was 15 years of age; for till then he was a quadruped.

The next ſtep of this progreſſion is the Ourang Outang, or *Man of the Woods*, as the name imports, by which he is called by the people of Africa, where he is to be ſeen, and who do not appear to have the leaſt doubt that he is a man; which, as they live in the country with him, they ſhould know better than we can do. Two of them I ſaw in London ſome years ago, and one of them I could have purchaſed for L. 50; which money, poor as I am, I would have given for him, and been at the expence of his education, if I had not been convinced, not only that *he* was a man, but that it was of abſolute neceſſity that, in the progreſs of the human ſpecies, man ſhould at ſome time or another be ſuch an animal: For, if he was originally a quadruped, as I think I have proved by facts inconteſtible, with only a natural aptitude, more than any other animal, to walk on two, as Ariſtotle has ſaid, the firſt ſtep in his progreſſion was to become a biped, to which, by nature, he was ſo much adapted. I will not here repeat what I have elſewhere ſaid at ſo great length, in proof of the humanity of the Ourang Outang *, where I think I have demonſtrated that he is a man, both in

* See chap. 4th of book 2d of vol. I. of the Origin of Language, 2d edition, and particularly p. 289. of that chapter, where I have ſummed up the evidence of his being a man: In which there is one circumſtance deſerving particular notice, that he carries off negro boys and girls to make ſervants of them, and keeps them for years, uſing them with great gentleneſs and humanity; a thing of which we cannot conceive any brute animal capable. See alſo what I have ſaid in the Appendix to vol.

in mind and body, and particularly as to his mind, by which, as I have obſerved, Ariſtotle has chiefly diſtinguiſhed animals: For I have ſhewn that he has the ſenſe of what is decent and becoming *, which is peculiar to man, and diſtinguiſhes him from the brute as much as any thing elſe. And he has a ſenſe of honour, which is really ſurpriſing, and ſuch as is not to be found in many men among us; for he cannot bear to be expoſed as a ſhow, nor to be laughed at; and travellers mention examples of ſome of them having died of vexation, for being ſo treated †. He has alſo the feeling of humanity in a ſtrong degree; and a ſenſe of juſtice, as is evident, from a remarkable example given ‡. Further, he has made ſome progreſs in the arts of life; for he builds huts §, and he has got the uſe of a ſtick for attacking or defending, which, as Horace obſerves ‖, was the firſt artificial weapon man uſed, after he had ceaſed to uſe his native weapons, his nails and fiſts. He has learned alſo the uſe of fire ¶, which is more than the inhabitants of the Ladrone Iſlands had learned, when they were diſcovered by the Portugueſe; and laſtly, he buries his dead **.

vol. III of this work, and particularly what I have there ſtated from a French Book of Travels, lately publiſhed, where there is a fact related, p. 360. which, if true, puts an end to the queſtion, viz. that the Ourang Outang not only copulates with females of our ſpecies, and produces children, but that the offſpring of that copulation does likewiſe produce.

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edit. p. 273. 279. and 291. From which paſſages, it appears, that both the males and females there mentioned had a ſenſe of modeſty, which made them conceal their nudities.

† Ibid. p. 282.—284.

‡ Ibid. p. 204.—288.

§ Ibid. p. 274.—277.—283.

‖ *Sermonum*, lib. 1. Sat. 3.

¶ Origin of Language, p. 285.

** Ibid. p. 274.

Thus I have proved, that the Ourang Outang is not only a man, with reſpect to his body, but alſo in mind, the principal part of man and of all other animals. As the reader, however, may be deſirous to know ſtill more of this wonderful phenomenon of human nature I will add here ſome information concerning him, which I have lately received from a gentleman of the name of Begg, who was captain of a Liverpool ſhip, employed in the ſlave trade on the coaſt of Africa. He was promiſed, he told me, a handſome reward, if he could bring home an Ourang Outang from Angola, where he ſaw herds of them, and was at great pains, with the aſſiſtance of his crew, to get hold of one of them; but to no purpoſe. He therefore reſolved, that as he could get none of them alive, he would try to get one or more of them dead: And accordingly he fired upon them, and killed ſome of them, which I am perſuaded he would not have done, if he had been as fully convinced, as I am, that they were of the human ſpecies. But in this, too, he was likewiſe diſappointed; for, before he and his crew could get to the place where they fell, they were carried off by their companions, for the purpoſe, as he ſuppoſes, of burying them, which, we are informed by others, they practice *.

I have correſponded with this gentleman likewiſe by letters, in one of which he ſays, that "In a voyage to Old Callabar in Africa, "I purchaſed a female Ourang Outang from one of the natives. She "was, as I was informed, about eight months old, four foot ſix "inches high, of a dark brown colour, but white about the breaſts; "of a gentle diſpoſition, walked generally upright on her hind feet, "ſometimes on all four; but the latter ſeemed to me not to be her "natural motion. Palm nuts, roots, and ſubacid fruits were her "favourite food. She would not eat beef or any animal ſubſtance. "Water, and wine drawn from the palm tree (very much eſteemed "by

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 274.

" by the natives), were her conſtant drink. She would often drink " a tumbler glaſs of wine and water, and always put the glaſs ſoft- " ly down on its bottom, and never broke one. She was very fond " of the girls and boys, but more particularly of the latter, and " would weep and cry like a child when ſhe was vexed; but never " ſhewed any ſigns of great ferocity, and was eaſily appeaſed. I " gave her a blanket for a bed, which ſhe would take great pains " to ſpread in ſuch a manner as to make it ſmooth and eaſy, and " then would lie down. She always ſlept with her hands (if I may " uſe the expreſſion) under her head, and would ſnore when aſleep, " reſembling the human ſpecies. She lived three months, and died " of the dyſentery.

" The following is the information I have been able to collect " from the inhabitants of Africa, where I have been, on whoſe ve- " racity we cannot altogether depend; but having compared diffe- " rent accounts, I always found them in a great meaſure to corre- " ſpond.

" That they have been ſeen in ſeparate great bodies, attacking each " other with ſticks with great animoſity. That they generally build " their neſts or houſes together in great numbers, a ſingle Ourang " Outang being but ſeldom or never ſeen ſeparately. That they " often have been known to beat and bruiſe the negroes, and even " to kill them, when fired at by them. That the common ſize of " an Ourang Outang is from five and half to ſix feet. That they " have great ſtrength in their arms, and run with great agility. " That they have a kind of chattering guttural noiſe they make, " but whether they can communicate their ideas or not to each o- " ther, I cannot ſay; but it is the received opinion among the na- " tives that they can. That dead Ourang Outangs have been found " covered with leaves of trees, but whether from accident or deſign " could not be aſcertained.—This is what Information I could ac-

" quire

" quire from the negroes; but I can by no means vouch for the truth " of any part of it. What I ſay from my own obſervation you may " depend on for fact."

From this account of Mr Begg, it is evident that they are ſo far advanced towards the political life, as to herd together, and to communicate together, by a chattering guttural noiſe, which, I am perſuaded, led the way among all people to articulation and the uſe of ſpeech. And the Briſtol merchant, with whom I have correſponded, and whoſe communications I have mentioned in the 1ſt volume of the Origin and Progreſs of Language *, ſays, that he heard that they were ſo far advanced in the political life, as to have a king or governor †. It appears alſo, from Mr Begg's account, that they have ſo much of the ſocial ſpirit in them, and are ſo much attached to their herd, as not to neglect them even when they are dead, but to carry off their bodies for burial.

This animal, it is to be obſerved, lives entirely upon the fruits of the earth; for the carnivorous diet I hold to be unnatural to man, and that he was firſt driven to it by neceſſity, which could not be the caſe of the Ourang Outang, who lives in a fruitful country, very thinly peopled. Further, he has not the uſe of water, except to drink it; for ſwimming or ſailing, I hold to be likewiſe unnatural to man, and that it was alſo neceſſity that firſt drove him to it.

There is another obſervation I have to make, which is, that the Ourang Outang ſometimes walks upon all four. And the Briſtol merchant, above mentioned, ſays, that the ſmalleſt claſs of this ſpecies, called *Chimpenza* by the natives, walks oftener on all four, than upright ‡. And there is a French writer, La Broſſe, who

* Page 281.

† Ibid. p. 282.

‡ Ibid. p. 282.

who has made a collection of voyages in the South Seas, one of which gives an account of an iſland, where the people, though they be ſo far advanced in the arts of life, as to have the uſe of ſpeech, yet walk ſometimes upon *all four*. This, I think, ſhews very clearly, that originally they walked upon all four, as well as the Ourang Outang; and that they have not been very long from that primaeval ſtate, any more than the Ourang Outang. Theſe examples, I think, prove very clearly what I have laid down in the preceding chapter, that man, in the firſt ſtage of his natural life, was a quadruped; ſo that it was very natural he ſhould retain that way of walking, in the firſt ſtages of his civilized life.

This account I have given of the Ourang Outang, agrees perfectly with the deſcription which Horace gives us of man, in the firſt ſtage of his exiſtence on this earth. I quoted it above, p. 27.; but I will give it here entire.

> Cum prorepſerunt primis animalia terris,
> Mutum ac turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
> Unguibus et pugnis, dein fuſtibus, atque ita porro
> Pugnabant armis, quae poſt fabricaverat uſus:
> Donec verba, quibus voces ſenſuſque notarent,
> Nominaque invenere: Dehinc abſiſtere bello,
> &c.

This account of man, in his firſt ſtate, applies ſo exactly to the Ourang Outang, that it may be ſaid to be a deſcription of him; for man is ſaid firſt to creep, that is, to go upon all four, and then he is very properly denominated *mutum ac turpe pecus*. After that, he is erected, and gets the uſe of an artificial weapon, ſuch as the Ourang Outang uſes. Next, he invents rude and barbarous cries, which Mr Begg calls chattering guttural ſounds, *quibus voces ſenſuſque notarent*, that is, by which men communicated their ſenſations, appetites, and deſires to one another. And, laſt of all, they formed ideas, and

and invented words to expreſs them, which Horace calls *nomina*. But this is a ſtep in the progreſs towards the civilized life, which the Ourang Outang has not yet made. This hiſtory of man, I am perſuaded, Horace learned from the philoſophers with whom he converſed in Athens; and I hold it to have been the general opinion of the Greek philoſophers at that time, and particularly of the Epicureans, who ſtudied facts of natural hiſtory very much *. Of this ſect Horace was, though not wholly addicted to it;

(Nullius addictus (as he ſays) jurare in verba magiſtri.)

but getting all the information he could from the other ſects of philoſophy.

There are, I know, many, who will think this progreſs of man, from a quadruped and an Ourang Outang to men ſuch as we ſee them now a days, very diſgraceful to the ſpecies. But they ſhould conſider their own progreſs as an individual. In the womb, man is no better than a vegetable; and, when born, he is at firſt more imperfect, I believe, than any other animal in the ſame ſtate, wanting almoſt altogether that comparative faculty, which the brutes, young and old, poſſeſs †. If, therefore, there be ſuch a progreſs in the individual, it is not to be wondered that there ſhould be a progreſs alſo in the ſpecies, from the mere animal up to the intellectual creature: But, on the contrary, I ſhould think it not agreeable to that wonderful order and progreſſion of things that we obſerve in nature, if it were otherwiſe; for the ſpecies, with reſpect to the genus,

* Epicurus was a diligent inquirer into facts of natural hiſtory, particularly concerning the progreſs of men in the invention of arts. And accordingly Lucretius tells us, that he diſcovered that men learned muſic from the ſinging of birds, which, as I ſhall preſently ſhew, is confirmed by what I learned from the ſavage girl I ſaw in France.

† See what I have ſaid of this comparative faculty, p. 13. of this volume.

nus, is to be conſidered as an individual, and accordingly it is called, by Ariſtotle, το ατομον τω ειδει.

The laſt ſtép of this progreſſion I likewiſe ſaw, and it was a great one. It was the wild girl, or *fille ſauvage*, as the French called her, who came from a country where the people had learned to articulate very imperfectly indeed, but ſufficiently to communicate their wants and deſires. I ſaw her in Paris about 26 years ago, and converſed with her much, as ſhe had been then in Paris for ſeveral years, and ſpoke French well enough. She was taken up by a French ſhip ſomewhere upon the coaſt of Labradore, and was carried to one of the Weſt India iſlands, from whence ſhe ſailed in a ſhip, which was wrecked upon the coaſt of Flanders, and only ſhe and a negro girl were ſaved. Her firſt appearance in France was at a village called Songè, near to Chalon in Champagne, whither I went to inquire about her. She was firſt ſeen there ſwimming a river, and coming out of it with a fiſh in her hand, which ſhe had caught: For ſhe told me, that in her country they lived like beavers, always near water, and caught the fiſh with their hands, by diving, as the people of the Ladrone Iſlands do. They were hunters, too; and ſhe and the negro girl, in their journey from Flanders, ſubſiſted on game, which they caught by ſpeed of foot. She ſaid, that in her country, beſides language, they had a certain muſic, which they had formed in imitation of birds. But they had no uſe of fire, and in that, too, they reſembled the people of the Ladrone Iſlands; and ſhe told me, that, when ſhe firſt came to France, a fire in a room was her terror and abhorrence; and the eating of fleſh, dreſſed by fire, threw her into a very bad diſeaſe, of which ſhe recovered with much difficulty. She was wonderfully ſwift of foot, and could overtake, in that way, almoſt any animal, and then knock it on the head with a bludgeon ſhe wore, which ſhe called a *boutou*, a name given, by the inhabitants of the Carrib-

bee Iſlands, to a bludgeon; from which it appears ſhe had been in one of thoſe iſlands, in her way from America to France. She could climb a tree, too, like a ſquirrel, and leap from one tree to another; but all theſe bodily faculties, ſhe told me, with much regret, ſhe had loſt at the time I ſaw her. Who would deſire to know more of her, may read her life, publiſhed at Edinburgh in the year 1768, tranſlated from the French by a clerk of mine, who was with me in France. The facts contained in the French work, I was aſſured, might be depended on, by M. la Condamine, who knew the lady that wrote it. In the preface prefixed to the tranſlation, I have related ſeveral facts concerning her, which I learned from the girl herſelf: And if the reader be deſirous to know ſtill more concerning her, he may read a converſation that I had with her, which I have printed from a pocket book that I then kept in Paris, and have publiſhed in the appendix to this volume.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The firſt ſtep that men made, in their progreſs to civilization, was to learn the uſe of their own body—firſt, *By erecting themſelves; then by learning the uſe of their hands; and laſtly to ſwim.—Swimming not natural to man; but his acquiſitions in that way wonderful.—Till man learned the uſe of his own body, he could not provide ſufficiently for his ſubſiſtence.—At firſt he lived upon the natural fruits of the earth.—Theſe failing, he took to fiſhing, being able to live upon any kind of food.—But agriculture could furniſh ſubſiſtence for numbers of men, living together in cloſe communication.—Before ſuch an art could be invented and practiſed, language was neceſſary.*

FROM thoſe examples of wild men I have mentioned, it is, I think evident, that the firſt art man muſt have learned, was the uſe of his own body: And he muſt have begun by erecting himſelf, without which he could not have had the advantage of the length of his body, for attack or defence, or for the practice of the ſeveral arts of life. Beſides, it gave him the *os ſublime*—enabled him to look at his native ſeat, the Heavens—and gave that dignity to his appearance, which was ſuitable for an animal that was deſtined to govern on this earth.

The neceſſary conſequence, too, of the erect poſture, was the uſe of the hands, a moſt uſeful organ, without which, as Xenophon ſays

well obſerved, our reaſon would have availed us little in the invention and practice of arts.

Thus far, therefore, the Ourang Outang is advanced in the arts of life; but he ſtill retains ſo much of his primitive natural ſtate, that he ſometimes goes on all four, as Mr Begg, in his letter, has ſaid, and alſo the French gentleman, above quoted*.

There is another uſe of the body, which man has not from nature, as many other animals have, but has learned by practice or teaching, I mean ſwimming: For of the Indians of North America, who excel us ſo much in bodily feats, none can ſwim, except thoſe who live near the ſea, or a great river, and have practiſed it, as Adair and others, who have publiſhed accounts of North America, tell us; and the wild girl, above mentioned, deſcribed to me very particularly, the pains her mother took to teach her to ſwim; but with that teaching and practice, ſhe became quite amphibious, ſuch as the inhabitants of the Ladrone Iſlands are, who ſubſiſt, in a great meaſure, by the fiſh which they catch with their hands in the ſea; though I am perſuaded, it was neceſſity which firſt drove man to ſeek for food in an element not natural to him.

There is a weekly publication in Spain, called *Semanario Erudito*, containing many curious facts. In a volume of it publiſhed in 1788, there is a piece written by Don Mechior de Macanaz, a gentleman of great learning, who was employed in many negociations, in the reign of Philip V. The tranſlation of it, for which I am obliged to a very learned and worthy gentleman of my acquaintance, Dr Geddes, who reſided for ten years in Spain, I have given in

* P. 27. of this volume. See alſo vol. III. of this work, p. 349. and 361.

in the note below, as it contains ſeveral other curious facts concerning wild men *.

From

* " Francis de la Vega, and Mary del Caſar, his wife, inhabitants of the village of " Liexganes, in the territory of Cudeyo, of the archbiſhopric of Burgos, two leagues " from Santander, had, beſides other children, a ſon called Francis, who, at the age " of fifteen years, having been apprentice to a joiner for two years at Bilboa, went " to ſwim with other boys, on the 23d of June in the year 1674, and diſap- " peared; nor was he again heard of, until he was caught like a fiſh in the ſea " near Cadiz, in the year 1679. He did not now ſpeak any language; but " having been brought to a convent of Franciſcans, he pronounced the word " *Liexganes*, the name of the village where he had been born. From this it " was conjectured, that he muſt have been of that place, and thither he was con- " ducted, and his mother immediately knew him. He remained there nine years: " He ate what they gave him; he put on his clothes and his ſtockings and ſhoes, " if he was deſired to do ſo: He carried a letter punctually enough to the place he " was ordered; and, having been ſent with one to Santander, he ſwam over the " bay, which is more than a league broad; and when he had got the anſwer, he re- " turned by the ſame way. He was ſix feet high; his hair was red and ſhort, like " to a new born child's; his complexion was fair. He ſeemed to be incapable of " reaſoning by himſelf; but capable of underſtanding what he was commanded to " do. He had loſt the habit of ſpeech: *Liexganes*, *pan*, *vino*, *tobacco*, were all the " words that he ſpoke, and theſe not to the purpoſe. His two brothers were then " alive, and Don Thomas, the elder, was a prieſt. After nine years he diſappeared " again, and was never ſeen, that we know, any more." Thus far the account of Francis de la Vega.

" In the ſame paper, Macanaz makes mention of Nicholas of Catania, in Sicily, who was wont to ſwim round that iſland, and to carry meſſages all around in that manner.

" He alſo mentions a woman, who was found on the coaſt of Weſt Friezeland, in the year 1430, and could never be taught more than to eat as we do, and to ſpin.

He

From the facts related in this Spaniſh work, joined with what I have publiſhed concerning mermaids *, it appears, that the human body is wonderfully adapted for every uſe, to which we can conceive it applicable: For he is not a land animal only, but likewiſe a ſea animal; at leaſt he may make himſelf ſo. And when he is ſo made, he is more truly amphibious than any other animal we know, as he can live wholly either on the land or in the water, which no other animal, we call amphibious, can do.

Man, therefore, is ſuperior in body to all other animals, as well as in mind: But he is ſo much a creature of art, that without art he has not the perfect uſe even of his own body. Till he had acquired that, he could not provide properly for his own nouriſhment, of which he required a great deal, being, in his original ſtate, a large animal, without diſeaſe, long lived, and all employed in the great work of nature, the propagation of the ſpecies. At firſt, I am

" He likewiſe ſays, that a man, to whom they gave the name of Joſeph Urſino, was caught in the woods of Lithuania, but could never be taught to ſpeak. He was found with bears.

" Finally he tells us, that about the year 1723, one of the inhabitants of Navarrens, a town of Bearne in the ſouth of France, when hunting in the Pirenean mountains, caught a wild man, and endeavoured to tame him. He ſtaid in a place called Ornes, and although they brought him to eat of whatever others eat; yet, when he came to the fields where they were, he devoured ears of wheat, as if they had been cherries; but they could not teach him to ſpeak. It was intended to carry him to the Regent, Duke of Orleans; but when thoſe that kept him heard of the regent's death, they became ſomething more careleſs in watching him, ſo that he eſcaped, nor could they ever again find him. He was in every reſpect like to other men in his body, and it was thought that he was the ſon of a miller of a place called *Compagna*, who was dead, and who had a ſon that had diſappeared ſome years before.

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 254.

am perſuaded, men lived upon the herbs and roots which the earth produced. And indeed, men in the firſt ſtage of their natural ſtate, when they walked upon all four, could not ſupport themſelves otherwiſe; for I do not think that at firſt they would ſeek food from the trees; and accordingly it is recorded that Pelaſgus firſt taught the Arcadians to feed on acorns. Peter the *Wild Boy*, while he was a quadruped in the woods of Hanover, fed upon graſſes, and the moſs of trees. This account we have of him from Hanover, immediately after he was caught *. And not only can perfect ſavages live in that way; but even men in the civilized life †. But when men increaſed very much in number, which they certainly did in the firſt ages of ſociety, the natural fruits of the earth could not maintain them. And therefore,

——— cum

* See vol. III of this work, p. 58.

† Appian, *De Bellis Punicis*, p. 6. and 63. *in fine*, as marked upon the margin of the Latin tranſlation of the Amſterdam edition. In the laſt quoted paſſage, ſpeaking of the Numidians, he has theſe words, τα πολλατων νομαδων ποα φαγουντων, δια τε αγεωργητον; which explains the reaſon why they fed upon graſs. Diodorus Siculus, lib. 3. cap. 23. where he gives an account of a people in Ethiopia, who live entirely upon the roots of reeds, that grow in the marſhes. See a great deal more upon this ſubject, which I have collected in vol. III. of this work, p. 371. and following; to which I may add the example of a man from Shetland, who died within theſe two or three years. His name was *Magnus Graham*. He was employed by the Hudſon's Bay Company, and loſt his way in that country, among the woods, where he remained for about ſix months, and had nothing to feed upon all that while, but any wild fruits he could find, which could not be many in ſo cold a country, and the bark of the pine tree, which was his chief ſubſiſtance. Upon this diet he lived all the time I have mentioned, and when he at laſt found his way back to the factory, he was lean indeed, but in very good health. This account I had from a gentleman who knew him very well, and told me upon what occaſion he was wandering in the woods, when he loſt his way, and by what accident he got back again to the factory; but theſe particulars it is unneceſſary here to relate.

——— cum jam glandes atque arbuta ſacrae
Deficerent ſylvae, et victum Dodona negaret,

then, and not till then, they took to hunting and fiſhing; for a fleſh or fiſh diet I hold to be unnatural to man, as unnatural as to an horſe or ox *. But ſo pliable is the human conſtitution, that he can ſuit himſelf to it, and even become very fond of it; and it was fit that he ſhould be ſuch an animal, as he was deſtined, by God and Nature, to ſpread all over the earth, and to live in every country and climate of it.

That man, before he took to agriculture, lived upon the natural fruits of the earth, and by hunting and fiſhing, is well known to thoſe who have ſtudied the hiſtory of man in antient books. Diodorus Siculus † has given us an account of many ſavage nations in India, and upon the coaſts of the Red Sea, who lived altogether upon the natural fruits of the earth, or upon hunting and fiſhing, which they practiſed in many different ways, ſome of them very extraordinary; and I think this is a very curious and entertaining part of his work, which is preſerved to us, as it ſhews us that man, in his diet and manner of life, as well as in other reſpects, is the moſt various animal on this earth. But it is not neceſſary that we ſhould go to antient books, to be informed that man can live in that way, and even prefer it to the life of agriculture: For a great part of the Tartars at this day live in that way, travelling in hords from place to place in ſearch of food; and it is an execretion among them, That a man may be condemned to live in one place, and to labour like a Ruſſian. But in this nomad life, men could have no regular polity, nor be governed

* That it was neceſſity which firſt drove men to this unnatural diet, is the opinion of Plutarch, περι σαρκοφαγιας, p. 456. edit. *Frobeni.*

† Book 3d. cap. 15. and following.

governed by laws. For that purpoſe it was neceſſary that they ſhould have a fixed habitation, and live together, in conſiderable numbers, in one place, for which agriculture is abſolutely neceſſary; and therefore Ceres was very properly ſaid, not only to be the goddeſs of agriculture, but of laws; and for that reaſon ſhe was called Θεσμοφορος *. Without ſuch a life, by which men have the cloſeſt intercourſe and communication, they could not have invented any arts and ſciences worth mentioning, and conſequently could not have made that progreſs in the recovery from their fallen ſtate, which, by God and Nature, they are deſtined to make even in this life. But in order to qualify man to live in that ſtate of ſociety, the uſe of language was abſolutely neceſſary, an art, without which there could have been neither ſciences nor arts of any value, nor civility or regular government among men. The practice of this art belongs to the ſubject of which I am treating in this chapter; I mean the uſe of the organs of the human body. But they are organs infinitely more delicate than the arms and legs, which are the only organs I have hitherto mentioned, being very much ſmaller, and concealed, for the greater part, in the mouth; nor is the uſe of them prompted by nature ſo much as that of thoſe other two. As Language is an art of the greateſt uſe, and which may be ſaid to have made man ſuch as we ſee him, and as it is at the ſame time of moſt difficult invention, and yet muſt have been the firſt art of any conſequence invented by man, being, as I have ſaid, the foundation of all other arts, I think it is not poſſible that man, without ſome ſupernatural aſſiſtance, could have invented an art, of which even the practice, after it is invented, is very difficult to be learned, and can hardly be learned

* Diodorus, lib. 5. cap. 68. and cap. 5. In which laſt paſſage he makes a very proper eulogium upon her, where he ſays, "that there could not be a greater benefaction to men, than what ſhe beſtowed upon them; for ſhe not only gave them the means of life, but taught them how to live properly."

at all, except in our earlieſt and moſt docible years. But of the invention and perfection of this art, which is ſo capital a part of the hiſtory of man, I will ſay a great deal more in the ſequel. In the mean time I will proceed to give an account of *man* in this ſecond ſtage of his natural ſtate, after he is erected, and has got the uſe of his hands and feet, but before he has learned the uſe of language, or of laws and government.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the habitation of man in the natural ſtate.—It was in caves, which nature furniſhed, or which he dug out of the rocks.—This proved by the authority of antient authors—and monuments ſtill exiſting.—Man as various in the form of his body, as in any thing elſe.—Of men with tails.—Of Satyrs, with feet of goats, and with horns upon their heads.—This proved by the teſtimony of St. Jerome.—*Of men without heads, but with eyes in their breaſts;—and of men with only one eye in their forehead.—Theſe facts atteſted by* St. Auguſtine.—*Of men with the heads of dogs—proved by the teſtimony of ſeveral authors.—Of the Sphynx.—The exiſtence of ſuch an animal only atteſted by Agartharchides.—This author had a very good opportunity of being informed.—His work is extant, and bears no mark of fable or romance.—No proof that ſuch animals did never exiſt, that they are not now to be found.—Reaſon why they ſhould have ceaſed to exiſt.—The wonderful variety of the outward form of man, as well as of his inward form.—Of the variety of the ſize of men in different ages and different nations of the world.—The civilized life makes a great difference in this reſpect.—But there is a difference alſo in the natural ſtate.—This proved by the example of the Ourang Outang.*

THAT man is more various, in his diet and manner of life, than any other animal, ſo various, that he is both a land and a ſea animal, I think I have proved in the preceding chapter. A ſhelter from the weather, and an habitation at land, Nature furniſhed him, while in the ſtate of nature, as well as his food; for he was protect-

ed from the injuries of the weather by thickets, rocks, and caves. In caves the Cyclops, as Homer tells us, lived; and in the ſame way, ſays Dionyſius, lived the Curetes in Crete *. The antient inhabitants of Italy lived in the hollows of trees; and the New Hollanders do the ſame at this day †. This laſt mentioned habitation Nature has provided for man, and alſo caves in many places: As to theſe, where Nature did not furniſh them, men have ſupplied the want by labour and art. Diodorus tells us, that in his time the inhabitants of the Balearic Iſlands dwelt in caves which they dug out of the rocks ‡. But before men could do this, they muſt have made ſome progreſs towards a life of civility and arts; for at firſt I am perſuaded, they uſed no other protection againſt the weather, but ſuch as the brutes uſe; that is, what nature has provided. When that was found not ſufficient, it was very natural that men ſhould make to themſelves habitations in the rocks, or under ground, before they learned to raiſe above ground that artificial habitation we call a houſe. And I am perſuaded, that thoſe excavations of rocks that are to be ſeen in Abyſſinia, and other parts of the world, and particularly in the iſland of Elephantis, off the coaſt of Bombay, where there are to be ſeen, not only ſingle houſes, but little cities and ſtreets, all cut out of the rocks §, were all the original habitations of men.

That

* Lib. 5. cap. 65.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 83.

‡ *Diodorus*, cap. 17.

§ See vol. III. of this work, p. 83. and 84. The ſame excavations of rocks are to be ſeen in another iſland, called *Salſet*, near to Goa. See Letters upon the Origin of the Sciences, p. 312. addreſſed to M. Voltaire by M. Bailly, printed in 1777. See alſo Churchhill's voyages, vol. 4th. p. 194, where we have, from the famous traveller Gemelli, an account of the excavations in the iſland of *Salſet*. We have an account, likewiſe, of thoſe of Elephantis, from Hamilton's New Account of the Eaſt Indies, vol. 1ſt. chap. 22. p. 241. See alſo Bryant's Mythology, vol. 3d. p. 561.

That clothes, as well as houſes, were the inventions of art, and not uſed by man in his natural ſtate, I hold to be certain. Our ſacred books have told us, that the firſt men were naked, as the inhabitants of the Ladrone and Pelew Iſlands are at this day. And the ſame books tell us, that the firſt clothing of men was ſkins, ſuch as the inhabitants of Terra del Fuego, and many other barbarous nations, wear at preſent.

Nor is man leſs various in the figure of his body, than in the other things I have mentioned; and the individuals of the ſpecies are, I am perſuaded, more different one from another than thoſe of any other ſpecies. And firſt, that there are men with tails, ſuch as dogs and cats have, I think I have proved beyond the poſſibility of doubt*. And not only are there tailed men extant; but men, ſuch as the antients deſcribe Satyrs, have been found, who had not only tails, but the feet of goats, and horns on their heads. One of this kind, we are told by St. Jerome, was, under the reign of Conſtantine the Emperor, publicly ſhewn in Alexandria, while he was alive; and after he was dead, his body was preſerved with ſalt, carried to Antioch, and there ſhewn to the Emperor†: So

561. 562. There are likewiſe to be ſeen in Upper Egypt, near to Thebes, *Syringes*, conſiſting of many paſſages, which lead to a variety of apartments. See Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. 22. p. 263. And there were in that part of Judea called Galilee, *Subterranes*, where dwelt great numbers of men, as Joſephus informs us, lib. 14. cap. 15. See alſo, upon this ſubject, Bryant's Mythology, vol. 3d, p. 502, 503.

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edit. p. 257. and following; and vol. III. of this work, p. 250. Beſides theſe authorities, there is one Wolfe, a German, who travelled in the iſland of Ceylon, and who ſays, that one of the titles of the King of that iſland, is *Deſcendant of the Tailed Monarch*.

† Tome 1. of St. Jerome's Works.

So that we ought not to treat as a fable, what the antients have told us of animals of that form*.

We have the authority of another father of the church, for a greater ſingularity ſtill of the human form; and that is, of men without heads, but with eyes in their breaſts. This is related by St. Auguſtine, who ſaw theſe men in Ethiopia, whether he went to preach the goſpel; and was ſome time among them, and relates ſeveral other particulars concerning them †. And the ſame ſaint tells us, that he ſaw, in the ſame country, men with only one eye in their forehead ‡. Nor do theſe facts reſt ſolely upon the authority of St. Auguſtine; but antient authors mention them, particularly Strabo, who tells the ſtory of men with eyes in their breaſts, which he ſays is atteſted by ſeveral authors whom he names, though he does not believe them. As to the men with one eye, it is related by Herodotus, of a people in Scythia, who, from that quality, had their name of *Arimaſpians*, as he interprets the word §. We muſt not therefore treat as a fable what Homer has told us of the Cyclops, any more than what is related, by other antient authors, of Satyrs.

There is another ſingularity of the human form, as great or greater than any I have hitherto mentioned, and that is, of men with the heads of dogs. That ſuch men did exiſt, is atteſted by the authors I have elſewhere mentioned ‖, whoſe authorities cannot, I think,

* See vol. III. of this work, p. 250. where Pauſanias is quoted giving an account of Satyrs, which he had from one Euphemus, who was an eye witneſs of what he related.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 252.

‡ Ibid. p. 253.

§ Ibid. p. 252.—253.

‖ Ibid. p. 263. and 264.

think, be queſtioned. One of them, by name Agatharchides, ſays, that they were to be ſeen in Alexandria in his time, having been ſent thither from Ethiopia and the country of the Troglodites. So that it appears, that the *Latrator Anubis*, as Virgil calls him, which was the form of one of the Egyptian gods, was not an imaginary form, but taken from real life.

This author, Agatharchides, mentions another animal of mixed form, having the head of a man and the body of a lion, ſuch as he is repreſented in ancient ſculpture, and is called a Sphynx. He ſays he was ſent to Alexandria from Ethiopia, with the dog-headed man above mentioned. And he deſcribes him to be, by nature, a tame and gentle animal, and capable of being taught motion to muſic; whereas the dog-headed men, he ſays, were exceedingly fierce, and very difficult to be tamed *. According, therefore, to this author, the ſphynx was no imaginary animal, but had a real exiſtence, as well as the dog-headed men. Agatharchides, however, is the only author, as far as I know, who mentions the ſphynx, as an animal actually exiſting; whereas the dog-headed men are mentioned by ſeveral other authors It may be obſerved, however, that Agatharchides had an opportunity of being very well informed; for he lived about the time of Ptolemy, III. king of Egypt, who had a great curioſity to be informed about the wild men of Ethiopia, and for that purpoſe ſent men to that country, particularly one Symmias, from whom Agatharchides got his information †. And I am diſpoſed to believe that he was well informed; for I have read his book, and I think it has all the appearance of being an authentic narrative, without any mixture of fable, unleſs we are diſpoſed to believe, that there never exiſted, on this earth, men different from thoſe we ſee now.

But

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 264.

† Ibid. p. 50.

But the variety of nature is ſo great, that I am convinced of the truth of what Ariſtotle ſays, that every thing exiſts, or did at ſome time exiſt, which is poſſible to exiſt *. And though it were certain that ſuch animals as the ſphinx, or the other animals that I have mentioned, did no longer exiſt on this earth, it would not from thence follow, that they never exiſted. I do not believe that men with eyes in their breaſts, or with only one eye in their forehead, are now to be found on the face of the earth: And yet I think we cannot doubt that they once exiſted in Ethiopia, where St. Auguſtine ſays he ſaw them. We are ſure that there are whole ſpecieſes of animals, which were once in certain countries, but are not now to be found there, ſuch as wolves in Britain. It is not probable that ſuch compounded animals, as the dog-headed man and the ſphynx, were ever very numerous; and if ſo, it is likely that they would be conſidered as monſters by the other men of the country, and ſo would be deſtroyed by them †.

Beſides theſe varieties in the whole form of man, there is a variety in one part of him, which I think wonderful, though, as it is ſo familiar to us, it be not commonly obſerved. The part I mean is the face, in which a man may obſerve, in a crowd of people, or walking the ſtreets of a populous city, ſuch a variety of form, and figure, and features expreſſing different diſpoſitions and ſentiments, as is really wonderful.

Thus I think I have ſhewn, that man is more various in the form of his body, than in any thing elſe; and that there is a peculiarity in

* See what I have ſaid in explanation of this maxim, in vol. III. of this work, p. 261.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 263.

in the form of ſome of the individuals of the ſpecies, which is not to be found in any other ſpecies; I mean the mixture of different ſpecieſes in the ſame animal. And yet I think it is not unnatural, if we conſider how much his inward part or mind is compounded; for it conſiſts not only of the vegetable and the animal life, but of the intellectual; and if ſo, I think it needs not be wondered, that his nature ſhould admit of a compoſition likewiſe, in his outward form, of different ſpecieſes of animals.

As to the ſize and ſtature of men in the different ages and nations, it would be indeed extraordinary, if in an animal, the moſt various upon this earth, there was not found the common variety of great and ſmall, a variety which, I believe, is to be found in every other animal on this earth. That ſuch a variety does in fact exiſt in our ſpecies, I think I have proved beyond all doubt in the third volume of this work *, where I have ſhewn, that not only in different nations there is a great difference of ſize, but in the ſame nation in different ages; and that it is in the natural ſtate that men are larger in body, ſtronger, and longer lived: And it is a truth of reaſon and philoſophy, as well as of fact and obſervation; for the eaſe, indulgence, and luxury of the civilized life, together with the unnatural diet, and all theſe continued through many generations, muſt neceſſarily produce a great degeneracy in the ſize, ſtrength, and longevity of men; unleſs we believe, that man could invent a way of living more conducive to the health and ſtrength of his body, than that which God and Nature have deſtined for him. If we ſhould not be convinced by the teſtimony of profane authors, our ſacred books furniſh us demonſtrative proof; for they tell us, that before the Flood, when men lived upon vegetables, that is, upon the natu-

* Page 135. and following.

ral diet, they were very much longer lived than after the Flood, when they fed upon fleſh, and conſequently more healthy, and of greater ſize and ſtrength. And I hold that they have been degenerating ever ſince, and ſtill continue to degenerate; which every man, who has lived ſo long as I, may obſerve: For I am now living, as Neſtor lived, with the third generation; and I can ſay with him, 'That I have ſeen ſuch men as I do not now ſee, 'nor ever expect to ſee *.' And I think I can add, as Neſtor does, 'That with ſuch men I lived and converſed.' And the ſame poet tells us, from the mouth of the Goddeſs of Wiſdom, 'That the children 'now are not like their fathers †.' A learned Roman, Solinus Polyhiſtor, aſks the queſtion, *Quis enim jam aevo noſtro non minor parentibus ſuis naſcitur?* To theſe teſtimonies may be added, that of the Greek philoſopher Empedocles, who ſays, 'That the men of his 'time were of the ſize of children, compared with antient men ‡.' Who would deſire to know more of the degeneracy of men, in ſize and ſtrength, may conſult a book written by one Hermannus Conringius, a German, entitled *De Habitus Corporum Germanicorum, antiqui ac Novi, Cauſis*, where he will find many curious facts concerning the ſtature of men, and a great deal concerning giants, who appear not only to have been in the land of Canaan, but in the northern parts of Europe, and indeed in every country in the world, of whoſe antient

* Ου γαρ πω τοιους ιδον ανερας, ουδε ιδωμαι,
'Οιον Πειριθοον τε, Δρυαντα τε, ποιμενα λαων,
Καινεα τ', Ε'ξαδιον τε, και αντιθεον Πολυφημον,
Θησεα τ' Αιγειδην, επιεικελον αθανατοισι.

Iliad I. v. 262.

† Ου γαρ τοι παιδες 'ομοιοι πατρι πελονται,
'Οι πλεονες κακιους, παυροι τε δε πατρος αρειους.

Odyſſ. II. v. 273.

‡ Plutarchus, *De Placitis Philoſophorum*, in the end of that work.

antient hiſtory we are well informed. And it appears to me, that in all countries there have been, in very antient times, a race of wild men of extraordinary ſtature, the remains of which continued in ſome families down to later times. Of the monuments of ſuch men there are many exiſting in different parts of the world; and particularly there are, in the north of Europe, works that it is impoſſible could be executed by men ſuch as we.

But we are not to imagine, that it is only the civilized life that makes the difference of the ſtature of men. In the natural ſtate there is a great difference; for of the Ourang Outangs, who are certainly in the natural ſtate, there are three kinds, very different in their ſize. The firſt, which are called Pongos or Impongos, are of very great ſize, betwixt ſeven and nine feet high, and prodigiouſly ſtrong. The third claſs of the Ourang Outangs, or Chimpenza, as they are called, are only about the height of five or ſix feet when they are erected. And the middle kind, or Itzena, as they are called, are greater than the Chimpenza, but leſs than the Pongo *: And that there were pigmies to be found in other parts of the world, as well as among the Ourang Outangs, I think I have proved very clearly in the third volume of this work †.

After man had learned all the uſes to which his body could be applied, and had made himſelf a ſea animal as well as a land, ſo that he was in every reſpect the moſt various animal upon this earth, I think it cannot be denied, that he was ſuperior to all other animals here below in bodily faculties: And I will only add, that he has from nature a ſtrength of conſtitution, ſuch as no other animal we know has: For, in the firſt place, he can ſubſiſt upon every thing

* See vol. III of this work, p. 281.—289.

† Ibid. p. 136.

the earth produces, even the graſs of the fields *; and not only upon the fruits of trees, but upon their barks; and he can live in all climates of the earth, and endure the greateſt extremities both of heat and cold †. But what I think ſhews the ſtrength of his conſtitution more than any thing I have mentioned, is the life of many people of faſhion in great towns, particularly in London, who not only feed upon what I call an unnatural diet, that is fleſh, and drink ſtrong liquors, but uſe fire, which, as Horace ſays, has brought upon the earth a cohort (he might have ſaid a legion) of diſeaſes. And not only do they not work off the effects of this unnatural life by any exerciſe worth mentioning; but they do not even enjoy the common benefit of air, at leaſt of a pure uncorrupted air; for if ſuch an air was to be got in a city like London, where the fuel uſed muſt neceſſarily fill the air with ſulphureous vapours, they do not go out to ſeek it. When they ſay they go *out*, they truly go *in*, as they do not walk the ſtreets, but uſe cloſe carriages, in which they may be ſaid to be poiſoned by their own breath. And if ſuch be the life of the people of faſhion in London, how much worſe muſt the life of the vulgar be, who beſides practiſing arts very unfavourable to health, uſe a drink the moſt pernicious of all the things which the art of man-

* Appian, *De Bellis Punicis*, p. 6. & 63. *in fine*. Herodotus, lib. 3. cap. 28. lib. 8. cap. 115.

† There is a book written upon this ſubject by a German of the name of Zimmerman, entitled, *Zoographie Geographique*, where he tells us, that man can live where the mercury falls 126 degrees below Zero, according to Fahrenheit's thermometer, which is the greateſt cold that art can produce by the mixture of ſal amoniac and ice. This cold, he ſays, the bears in Nova Zembla cannot bear, nor any other animal, except man and the white fox. And he tells us, that in Greenland the men have their bodies very ſlightly covered, their head and neck quite uncovered, and no fires in their huts. As to heat, he relates, upon the authority of a French academician, that women can work in an oven heated to the degree of 275, by the ſame thermometer, which the academician ſays he ſaw.

man has invented for his own deſtruction, I mean ſpirituous liquors, which, ſo far from being fit for the drink of any animal, are fuel for fire, producing a quick and violent flame. The being able to endure ſuch a life for any number of years, and without that regimen which the antients uſed conſtantly for the preſervation of their health, I mean bathing, anointing, and friction with a kind of curry-comb, which they called *Strigil*, ſhews, in my opinion, a greater ſtrength of conſtitution than that of the inhabitants of an iſland a degree farther ſouth than the Straits of Magellan, whom Sir Francis Drake ſaw quite naked; or than the inhabitants of Terra del Fuego, who are very ſlightly clothed, wearing nothing but ſkins looſely tacked about them, and yet have no diſeaſe, as far as we know, except blear eyes, which they have got from hanging over the fire, the uſe of which they appear to have learned from ſome of the nations upon the continent, and in that reſpect were more unfortunate than the inhabitants of the Ladrone Iſlands, or of the country from which the ſavage girl, whom I ſaw in France, came.

That this way of living muſt ſhorten life, is evident. But what I think much worſe, it makes that ſhort life end with a long and miſerable death: For ſuch men are nine years a killing, the death that Othello in the Play wiſhes that Caſſio may die. And I have known ſome of them, that were 20 years a killing by doctors and apothecaries; a death infinitely more miſerable than that of Damien, which laſted only one day.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the character of man in his natural ſtate,—Not known what his character was in the firſt ſtage of that ſtate, when he was a quadruped;—but from what we know of the Ourang Outang, man in the ſecond ſtage of his progreſſion, is a ſocial, friendly animal, and capable of intellect and ſcience.—To judge of a man in the civilized ſtate, after he has got the uſe of language, a diſtinction is to be made betwixt thoſe who live by hunting, and thoſe who ſubſiſt upon the fruits of the earth.—The inhabitants of the Pelew Iſlands a ſpecimen of what men are in the firſt ſtate of civilization, and before they are hunters.—The wrong conſtruction given by ſome men to the behaviour of the inhabitants of the Pelew Iſlands towards us.—The behaviour of the New Zealanders as noble and generous as that of the Pelew men.—A remarkable inſtance of their behaviour given.

HAVING ſaid ſo much of the body of man in his natural ſtate, I think it will be proper to ſay ſomething of his mind. It is by mind, chiefly, as Ariſtotle has obſerved, that the ſeveral ſpecieſes of animals are diſtinguiſhed from one another. And the ſeveral ſtates of an animal, of ſuch wonderful progreſſion as man, muſt be marked by a great difference of character or diſpoſition of mind.

What the mind of man was, while he was a quadruped, we cannot, from fact or experience, determine with any certainty, as ſo few

few examples have been found of men living in that ſtate. But I think we may gueſs what his character was, from what we know of him after he was erected, but without the uſe of ſpeech; and alſo from what we know of him in the firſt ages of civility, after he had learned to ſpeak. And firſt, there is the Orang Outang, who has not the uſe of ſpeech, but is of a character mild and gentle, affectionate too, and capable of friendſhip and attachment to particular perſons, with the ſenſe alſo of what is decent and becoming. He is ſocial too, and lives in herds; ſo that with regard to his character, he is undoubtedly a man, and a much better man than many that are to be found in civilized countries. And as to his capacity of intellect and ſcience, he has I think ſhewn, by the arts, few as they are, which he has invented, (ſuch as that of arming himſelf with a weapon, and erecting huts to protect him from the weather), but which are as many as could well be expected that he ſhould have invented in his ſtate of life, that he is not defective in the capacity of intellect and ſcience.

As to nations in the firſt ages of civility, we muſt make a diſtinction betwixt men living upon the natural fruits of the earth, and thoſe who ſubſiſt by hunting and feed on fleſh, which changes the natural character of man, and makes him not only more cruel and ferocious, but alſo more cunning and deceitful than he would otherwiſe be; for it is by cunning and ſurpriſe that he ſeizes his prey. To diſcover, therefore, what man by nature is in the firſt age of civility, before he becomes a hunter, we muſt go to the Pelew Iſlands, a diſcovery lately made, which I think of great value. There we find men, that are not only kind and hoſpitable, but generous and noble minded: So that when they go to war, they ſcorn to make it by ſtratagem and ſurpriſe; but fairly tell their enemy when and where they are to attack them.

There-

There are ſome, I know, who think that their hoſpitality and kindneſs to us, was only a device to lull us into ſecurity, that they might have an opportunity of murdering us, and ſeizing our iron tools, of which they were very fond, and the other inſtruments of art which we uſed. But, as Mr Pope ſays,

> ——— I who think more highly of our kind,
> (And ſurely heaven and I are of a mind),

believe, that their behaviour to us proceeded from that worth and goodneſs which is natural to man. Nor indeed can I be perſuaded, that they would act ſo nobly, and with ſuch heroic greatneſs of mind to their profeſt enemies, and behave ſo baſely and treacherouſly to us, whom they had received ſo kindly and hoſpitably, and with whom they were living in the greateſt friendſhip and confidence *.

There

* There is an account of this people publiſhed by Mr Keate, which is one of the moſt entertaining books I ever read. I have done it an honour which I have done very few modern books; for I have read it twice, and both times with very great pleaſure and inſtruction. It preſents a moſt agreeable picture of human nature in the firſt ages of ſociety, uncorrupted by the crimes and vices of ſuch ſocieties as thoſe of Europe are at preſent. And it confirms me in an opinion which I have always had, but which was never before ſo verified by fact and experience, that man is, by his nature, a generous, noble minded animal, full of benevolence and kindneſs to his ſpecies, and moſt ready to relieve men in diſtreſs, though not only altogether ſtrangers, but of a race of men entirely different from them, and ſuch as they had never ſeen before. They are brave and magnanimous, ready to encounter danger and death upon all occaſions for their country and their friends, and at the ſame time living in the greateſt peace and good order with one another, under a government which, as it is moſt natural, ſo I think it is the beſt, by a king, a council, and an order of nobles, out of which the council and the great officers of ſtate are choſen.

Our

There is another people, who, like the inhabitants of the Pelew iſlands, having no four footed animals in their country, are not hunters;

Our people lived thirteen weeks among them, and in cloſe intercourſe with them, and had an opportunity, during that time, to ſee their behaviour, not only in peace, but in war, in which they accompanied them and aſſiſted them; and during that time, it does not appear that they diſcovered any crime, vice, or folly among them; but on the contrary, found them poſſeſſed of every virtue and every amiable quality, with a politeneſs and delicacy of ſentiment which could not have been believed, if it were not ſo well atteſted. They verify the truth of an obſervation made by Ariſtotle, "That the love of knowledge is natural to man," though it be a paſſion which, according to my obſervation, is one of the weakeſt among us: For they ſhewed a love of knowledge, and a deſire to be inſtructed in all our arts, which was really ſurpriſing, and was moſt eminent (among other eminent qualities), in that young man the king's ſon, whom they carried with them, and who, if he had lived, would, I am perſuaded, have done the greateſt honour to his nation, and to human kind. They live in the moſt natural way, in ſo far that they wear no clothes, eat very little fleſh, uſe no ſtrong liquors at all, but live almoſt altogether upon the fruits of the earth, ſuch as yams and cocoa nuts. At the ſame time they bathe, and anoint with oil; both which are practiſed by ſo many different nations, both ſavage and civilized, that I believe they are arts for preſerving health, which inſtinct directs men to practice. But as they depart ſo far from nature, as to live in houſes and to uſe fire, they are liable to ſome diſeaſes, particularly thoſe of the ſcrophulous kind.

As to the ſtile of this work, I ſhould like it much better if it were more ſimple, and with leſs affectation of ornament. But I obſerve, that what Mr Keate has put into the mouth of the king of Pelew, or of his officers, is excellent, not only for the matter, but for the ſtyle, which is perfectly plain and natural; ſuch as what he makes the king ſay upon occaſion of the ſuſpicions of him which the Engliſh might entertain, (p. 249. of the third edition), and what his general ſays in defence of the Engliſh, (p. 221.). And indeed it would have been moſt abſurd, to have made men, doing every thing in ſo natural a way, ſpeak in the florid ſtyle of Mr Gibbons. I can, however, pardon him for the uſe of that ſtyle, in his declamations upon the philanthropy of the Pelew men, which was really wonderful. But the ſpeeches I have mentioned, I am perſuaded, he does not write in his own ſtile, but gives them, both matter and ſtile, as Captain Wilſon had them from the interpreter.

hunters; I mean the New Zealanders. They ſhew a ſpirit as noble and generous as the men of the Pelew Iſlands. I was aſſured, by a man who accompanied Captain Cook in that expedition, and who is now our conſul at Morrocco, *Mr Mattra*, that, while we were at war with them, they ſcorned to attack any ſmall party of our men with any great number of their own: And Dr Solander, now dead, who attended Captain Cook in that expedition, told me a ſtory of them, of which Sir Joſeph Banks is ſtill a living witneſs. He ſaid, while they were yet in terms of hoſtility with the New Zealanders, Sir Joſeph and he went to a little iſland off the coaſt of New Zealand to botanize, which the New Zealanders obſerving, ſet off in their canoe, in order to intercept them; to prevent which, our people ſet out with their long boat. But the canoe got to the iſland before the boat, and laid hold of Sir Joſeph and Dr Solander, who gave themſelves up for loſt: And Sir Joſeph, he told me, had his hand at his piſtol, reſolved to ſell his life as dear as he could. But thoſe ſavages, as we call them, were ſo generous and noble minded, that they did not offer the leaſt violence to them, but waiting till their countrymen came up to them, put them into their hands, and then bid them defend themſelves, as the Otaheite man, who was with them, interpreted their words. Upon this they made a very fierce attack upon our people, who were obliged to kill ſome of them before they could beat them off.

Many other examples might be given of the good diſpoſitions of men

I will conclude this long note with obſerving, that it is not much to be wondered, that our people, conſidering the ſituation they were in, ſhould be very ſuſpicious of treachery on the Pelew men. It was very natural for them to judge of the character of theſe people, by that of the men among whom they had lived; and it was a very high compliment they paid to the Pelew men, to believe their generoſity and noble behaviour incredible, when they had ſuch temptation to act a contrary part.

men in the firſt ages of civil life. The people of Hiſpaniola, when the Spaniards firſt came among them, were, as we are informed by Charlevoix, a humane, kind, and hoſpitable people; and without citing more examples, I believe it to be true what Captain Cook ſaid to the late Sir John Pringle, 'That all thoſe we call ſavages, a-'mong whom he was, were kind and hoſpitable, (unleſs where they 'were provoked, by ill treatment, to be otherwiſe), with the higheſt 'ſenſe of what is honourable and praiſe-worthy.'

CHAP. VI.

Of the progreſs of man from a natural ſtate, to a ſtate of civility and arts.—Such a progreſs abſolutely neceſſary.—The firſt ſtep of this progreſs was living in herds.—Of the motives which induced men to live in that way.—Animals divided, by Ariſtotle, into gregarious and not gregarious;—and into political and not political.—Man of the mixed kind—both gregarious and ſolitary; political and not political.—Man not induced to aſſociate by inſtinct, or any particular attachment to his ſpecies—proved that he has no ſuch attachment.—It was therefore neceſſity or convenience that made him aſſociate.—This the caſe of the Ourang Outang.—Men in that ſtate lived like brutes, though they were both gregarious and political.—Examples of other animals living in that way.—That way of living far removed from a ſtate of civility and arts.—Language abſolutely neceſſary to form ſuch a ſtate.—Man muſt have formed ideas before he can have the uſe of ſpeech.—Language a wonderful art, but the formation of ideas more wonderful.—The formation of ideas our firſt ſtep from the mere animal life.—This is a moſt difficult ſtep, being from nature, where all things are mixed with all.—The progreſs of ideas, from the loweſt ſpecies to the higheſt genus.—We diſcover differences of things, and divide as well as unite.—Of the Categories, *by which the whole things in the Univerſe are reduced to certain claſſes.—This the greateſt diſcovery of philoſophy that ever was made.—But the human mind goes beyond the Categories, and diſcovers what contains the Categories, and every thing in the Univerſe.—This progreſs moſt wonderful, from what is loweſt in nature to what is higheſt.—Language neceſſary for that progreſs.—Therefore it is the parent art of all arts and ſciences.*

HAV-

HAVING ſaid ſo much of man in his natural ſtate, I proceed to conſider him in a ſtate of civility and arts, beginning with his progreſs from the natural to that ſtate; for that there muſt have been a progreſs, and that he did not become at once an animal of civility and arts, is what no perſon can doubt, who knows any thing of the hiſtory or philoſophy of man; or if he be ſo ignorant of that hiſtory and philoſophy, as to have any doubt in the matter, I think what I have ſaid in the firſt volume of the origin of language may ſatisfy him.

The firſt ſtep in this progreſs muſt have been *aſſociating*, or *living together in herds*, as the Ourang Outangs do at preſent, and as many people of the antient world did *; and the firſt thing to be conſidered is, What prompted man to live in that way? Was it inſtinct, ſuch as prompts cattle and ſheep to herd together; or was it ſome motive of neceſſity or convenience?

Ariſtotle has divided animals, very properly, into gregarious and ſolitary, and ſome that partake of both kinds; and the gregarious he has ſubdivided into political and not political. The political he defines to be thoſe who carry on ſome common work, that is, a work for behoof of the whole herd; whereas thoſe, who are not political, carry on no common work, and therefore have no bond of union, though they herd and live together †. Man, he ſays, is that kind of animal, which is neither altogether gregarious nor altogether ſolitary, but participates of both. So that here we may obſerve another variety in our ſpecies, not hitherto mentioned, by

* Origin of Language, vol. I. book 2. chap. 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7.

† This diviſion of animals I have explained in the ſecond chapter of the ſecond book of the firſt volume of the Origin of Language, where I have alſo corrected the text of Ariſtotle.

by which he is both ſocial and not ſocial: So that man appears to be made up of contradictions; for he has intellect, and he has not intellect; he is a biped, and he is not a biped; he is a land animal, and he is not a land animal; he is a water animal, and not a water animal; and, among other varieties, he is, according to Ariſtotle, gregarious, and not gregarious; to which may be added, political, and not political. He is therefore as much mixed in mind, as I have ſhewn that he is in body; ſo that he can hardly be ſaid to be one ſpecies of animals, but a compound of all ſpecieſes.

That man can live in the ſolitary ſtate, is proved by many examples of ſolitary ſavages that have been found: And that in ſuch a ſtate he has no inſtinct or inclination which prompts him to aſſociate with his fellow creatures, is evident from this, that theſe ſolitary ſavages, when they are firſt diſcovered, run away from men, which was the caſe particularly of the ſavages that were diſcovered in the Pyrenean mountains *: For that by nature and inſtinct we have not that attachment to our ſpecies, which other animals have is evident, from a peculiarity of man that I have not yet mentioned, namely, that he is the only land animal that feeds upon his own ſpecies, and prefers that food to any other. This I have elſewhere very clearly proved †. It was therefore ſome reaſon of convenience

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 46. and 47.

† Origin and Progreſs of Language, vol. 1. p. 227, 228, and 229, in the note. Nor does this contradict what I have ſaid of the worth and goodneſs of the people of the Pelew Iſlands; for the New Zealanders are as generous and noble minded a people as thoſe of Pelew, yet they eat their enemies. And the fact is, that when men have once got a taſte of animal food, they become very fond of it, as we ſee men among us are very fond of many things ſtill more unnatural than the fleſh diet, ſuch as tobacco and ſpirits. But men, farther advanced in civility and arts than the

venience or neceſſity that firſt made men herd together. The Ourang Outangs aſſociate for the ſame reaſon that they are armed with a ſtick; that is, to defend themſelves againſt the elephants, and to drive them out of their paſture; alſo to fight with the blacks, and with one another, when they quarrel. And as they build huts, they, no doubt, join in companies for that purpoſe. He is therefore a political animal for the ſame reaſon that he is gregarious, that is, for the ſake of neceſſity and convenience.

That men, when they were no farther advanced in the ſocial and political life, lived together in the brutiſh way, copulating promiſcuouſly, without diſtinction of families or races, is evident from antient hiſtory *. And indeed men could not be ſaid to be removed from the brutes, when they only herded together, and carried on ſome work jointly for the behoof of the whole herd; for there are ſundry ſpecieſes of brutes that herd together for that purpoſe, particularly the beaver, an animal which reſembles man in this particular, that he can live either by himſelf or in ſociety; and is not, by the neceſſity of his nature, ſocial and political, like the bee or ant †.

Thus

the New Zealanders, will abominate the uſe of their own ſpecies for food, though there are ſundry examples of their being driven by neceſſity to take to it; and the men, ſo neceſſitated, have all agreed with the North Americans, mentioned in the paſſage quoted in the beginning of this note, that it is the moſt delicious of all fleſh. And it is ſaid, that a lion, that has once taſted human fleſh, prefers it to all other: So that here we may ſee another excellency of our ſpecies, that our fleſh is a more delicious food than that of any other animal.

* Origin of Language, vol. I. book 2d. chap. 3d.

† Ibid. p. 417. and following, where there are examples given of other animals living in the ſame way.

Thus far, therefore, man is advanced from the ſolitary ſavage, ſo as not only to be gregarious, but even political, in Ariſtotle's ſenſe of the word. But he is ſtill far removed from that ſtate of civility, which is abſolutely neceſſary for the invention and cultivation of arts and ſciences, by which only he can make any progreſs in this life, towards regaining the ſtate from which he has fallen. For that purpoſe, a regular polity muſt be formed, and properly carried on. Now, this cannot be done without language, which, I think, I have ſhewn clearly, is not from nature, but more a thing of art, than any other thing among men. Language, therefore, may be ſaid to be the foundation of all arts and ſciences: For it is only by that communication among men, which language beſtows upon them, that any art worth mentioning, or ſcience, can be invented or cultivated; for though men may herd together, and carry on ſome joint work, by inarticulate cries, or by ſigns and geſtures, as the beavers do *, it is impoſſible that without language they can have any thing that can be called government, or become an animal of intellect, not in capacity merely, but in energy and actuality. But men, before they could have the uſe of language, muſt have formed ideas to be expreſſed by words; for a language, having only names for individual objects perceived by the ſenſes, would not deſerve the name, nor afford the uſe of a language.

That language is a wonderful invention, every ſcholar, and indeed every man of ſenſe and obſervation, muſt know. This even a ſavage of North America knew, who, in converſation with a miſſionary, acknowledged that the Europeans had much more wit than they; 'But,' ſays he, 'has any of you invented a language †?' But that

* Origin and Progreſs of Language, vol. I. p. 417.

† Ibid. p. 566.

that operation of our minds, by which we form ideas, is ſtill more wonderful. As this is a view in which ideas have never been conſidered, I will enlarge a little upon it.

To be convinced of this, let us conſider that our firſt ſtep, from the mere animal to the intellectual creature, is the forming of ideas; for it is that which gives us intellect in *actuality*, which, in our natural ſtate, we had only in *capacity*. Now the beginning of all things is the moſt difficult; and it is particularly ſo in this caſe, if we conſider, that all our ideas are formed from Nature. Now, what does Nature preſent to us? It is what may be called a Chaos, where every thing is mixed with every thing, animals, vegetables, and minerals, the elements of earth, water, air, and fire; the heavens above, and the earth below. Theſe are all perceived by our ſenſes, which are our only inlets to knowledge in this ſtate of our exiſtence. But the ſenſes perceive them altogether in the lump, and as they exiſt in nature; but in order to form ideas of them, we muſt arrange them, and perceive their ſeveral relations and connections. This is done, as I have ſhewn *, by the two great faculties of the human intellect, abſtraction and generalization; that is, by dividing and uniting. As the face of Nature preſents to us all things, as I have ſaid, mixed with all, in which way they are perceived by our ſenſes, it is of abſolute neceſſity that they ſhould be divided and conſidered ſeparately, otherwiſe it is impoſſible we can form that diſtinct notion of them, which we call an idea. And particularly it is neceſſary, that in forming the idea of any material ſubſtance, we ſhould abſtract it from the matter. And here there is another eſſential difference betwixt the idea and the perception of ſenſe, which perceives nothing but what is material in the ſubject.

* P. 17. of this volume.

As to the uniting, we muſt perceive what is common to many things, and in that way connect and join the things together, which is called generalization, or, as it is expreſſed by Plato, perceiving *the one* in *the many*. By the firſt operation of diviſion, we ſee what is principal in any individual thing, and ſeparate it from the other qualities of the thing; and thus conſidering it by itſelf, we form the *particular* idea of that individual thing. Then we exerciſe the other faculty of uniting, by which we diſcover, that this particular idea is common to many other individuals: And thus, by ſeeing this one thing in the many, we form the *general* idea of the ſpecies, as of a *man*, for example, or *a horſe* *. But not ſtopping here, we go on, and find that the one thing, which is common to the man and horſe, is common to other things; and thus we form the idea of the genus Animal, where we ſee *the one* in many more things than we ſaw it before. From *animal* we aſcend to *animated body*, or the το εμψυχον, as the Greeks call it, comprehending both animals and vegetables. And from thence our next ſtep is to *body*, and from *body* to *ſubſtance*, which is one of the Categories. And thus we go on diſcovering *the one* in the *many*, but that *many* always increaſing. And while we thus unite things, which ſeem, at firſt ſight, ſo remote from one another, perceiving what they have in common, we perceive alſo in what they differ; and this is what is called the *ſpecific difference*, by which the ſeveral ſpecieſes of the ſame genus are diſtinguiſhed from one another. And while we thus go on, inveſtigating the different relations and connections of things, we diſcover that ſome things exiſt by themſelves, while other things have no ſuch

* See what I have ſaid of particular and general ideas, in vol. III. of this work, p. 341. and the paſſages there quoted; where I have ſhown the abſurdity of ſuppoſing that there could be *general* ideas, if there were not *particular*; or that an idea could be abſtracted from any corporeal ſubſtance, if it did not exiſt in it: And yet our philoſophers, at preſent, ſpeak of *general* and *abſtracted* ideas, as if they were the ſame.

ſuch independent exiſtence, but exiſt in other things, and yet of theſe we form ſeparate ideas; ſo that, in this formation of ideas, we divide things that are by nature indiviſible, ſuch as ſubſtances and their accidents, and which, by the ſenſes, are always perceived together. Of *accidents* we form ideas, as well as of *ſubſtances*, and by the ſame proceſs of dividing and uniting. In this way we form the idea of *magnitude* or quantity continuous, and of *number* or quantity diſcrete, and a more general idea ſtill, that of *quantity*. And in the ſame manner we form ideas of the qualities of body, ſuch as *figure* and *colour*.

The number of ſpecieſes, as well as of individuals, is infinite with reſpect to us and our comprehenſion, but not in the nature of things: For as the univerſe is a ſyſtem, it can admit of nothing infinite, but every thing muſt have meaſure and bounds. But though the ſpecieſes be infinite, with reſpect to us, ſcience has contrived, (and a wonderful work of ſcience it is), to reduce the genuſes to certain claſſes, and to number theſe claſſes. This was a diſcovery of the Pythagorean ſchool, and the greateſt diſcovery, in my opinion, that ever was made in philoſophy, by which all the things in this univerſe are claſſed and numbered. The work is very properly entitled, by Archytas, the author of it, περὶ τοῦ παντὸς, that is, *Of the whole of Things*; but in the Treatiſe of Ariſtotle, that we have on the ſubject, and which is little more than the work of Archytas tranſlated from the Doric to the Attic, it is entitled, *Of the Categories;* for, as he makes it part of his logic, he gives thoſe higheſt genuſes the name of the Praedicates of Propoſitions *.

This progreſs of the human mind, from objects of ſenſe, with which

* Who would deſire to know more of the Univerſals of Archytas, and the Categories of Ariſtotle, may read the 3d book of vol. I. of this work, particularly the firſt three chapters.

all our knowledge in this life muſt begin, to the univerſals contained in the Categories, by which, as I have ſaid, we make an arrangement and diſtribution of all the things in the univerſe, muſt appear very wonderful to the philoſopher, who conſiders of what infinite variety thoſe things are, and how mixed and ſeemingly confuſed they are preſented to the ſenſes. But the human intelligence does not ſtop even here; for it goes beyond the Categories, and not only perceives an infinite number of things contained in them, but alſo that which contains the Categories; ſo that it perceives not only the *one* in many different objects, of number infinite, but it diſcovers the *one in all;* that is, it diſcovers *God*, who virtually contains in himſelf all things of this univerſe: For, as our ſacred books tell us, *all things are in God, and God in all things.* And thus, by a ladder, ſuch as Jacob ſaw in his dream, reaching from heaven to earth, at the top of which was the Lord *, we aſcend, from what is loweſt in nature, that is, objects of ſenſe, to what is higheſt. But to explain this more particularly, belongs to Theology, which is not our ſubject at preſent.

I will only add farther, upon the ſubject of ideas, that every idea we form is a ſyſtem; for even the particular idea of the individual thing is a ſyſtem, as we perceive in it what is principal and what is ſubordinate. The ſpecies is a larger ſyſtem, in which we take in many things, and perceive what they have in common, and how they are connected together. And thus we proceed, from leſſer to greater ſyſtems, till we comprehend, as far as we are able, the ſyſtem which comprehends all other ſyſtems, I mean the ſyſtem of the univerſe, and its Great Author. Thus it appears, that a good logic, which explains accurately the nature of ideas, does lead us, by the moſt natural progreſs, up to Theology, in which all ſcience ends: So that it is of the utmoſt importance to philoſophy, that we ſhould learn a logic which teaches us to diſtinguiſh betwixt ideas and ſenſations,

* Geneſis, chap. xxviii. v. 13.

tions, and not to confound them, as Mr Locke has done. What I have ſaid here, and elſewhere, I hope will enable every man of common ſenſe to make the diſtinction, and to perceive, not only that the operation of the mind, by which we form ideas, is perfectly different from the perceptions of ſenſe; but that the objects are quite different; for the intellect, by which we form our ideas, perceives nothing but in ſyſtem; whereas the ſenſe perceives nothing in that way, but only corporeal objects, not analyſed, as they are by the intellect, but altogether in a lump with their ſeveral qualities *.

It may be farther obſerved, that as there can be no ſyſtem, but of things which have a connection and relation to one another, in forming the ſeveral ſyſtems of our ideas we perceive all the connections and relations that can be imagined betwixt things: For we perceive the genus, the ſpecies, the difference, what is proper or peculiar, and what is accidental, in things; and theſe comprehend all the ſeveral relations of conformity or diverſity, in which the things of this univerſe ſtand to one another. Theſe are the *five words*, which Porphyry, and his commentator Ammonius Hermeias, have ſo well explained. The work is very properly entitled, by Philoponus, Εισαγωγη, or *Introduction*, and indeed it is the beſt introduction to philoſophy that ever was written †.

And this ſuperior faculty of our minds, by which we perceive things in ſyſtem, and in ſyſtem only, and by which we proceed from leſſer to greater ſyſtems, ſhould convince us, that we are not deſtined,

* See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject, in vol. III. of this work, p. 342. and following, where I have ſhewn that intellect is as incapable of perceiving the objects of ſenſe, as ſenſe is of perceiving the objects of intellect.

† See what I have farther ſaid of this valuable work, in vol. V. of Origin of Language, p. 413.

deſtined, by God and nature, only to eat and drink in this world, and to enjoy other ſenſual pleaſures, but for a much more noble end; —To contemplate the ſeveral ſyſtems of which this univerſe is compoſed, and the univerſe itſelf and its Great Author, the contemplation of which may be called the *Beatific Viſion*, being the greateſt happineſs of which our nature is capable.

This world of ideas, upon which I have enlarged ſo much, and which may be called *the intellectual world* of our *microcoſm*, could never have been formed without the uſe of language: For, in the firſt place, we muſt have had certain ſigns or marks of our ideas, which would be abſolutely neceſſary for our own uſe, as without them we could not retain them in our memories, or put them together in propoſitions. And, *ſecondly*, we could not otherwiſe have communicated them to one another. Now it is by communication, in the way of diſcourſe, that all arts and ſciences have been invented and cultivated, and regular forms of government framed, under which men might live in peace and good order, and be ſupplied with all the neceſſaries of life, ſo that they might have time to apply to arts and ſciences. Language, therefore, may be ſaid to be the parent of all arts and ſciences, and to be the firſt ſtep of that ladder, by which we are to aſcend from this earth to that ſtate from which we are fallen.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Of the progreſs of the human mind from ideas to Science.—Ideas the materials only of Science.—They muſt be put together in order to make ſcience.—This done by propoſitions.—All Propoſitions conſiſt of a praedicate and a ſubject.—The praedicate *the more general idea, containing the* ſubject *being the leſs general idea.—Of the manner in which one idea contains another;—and how the more general idea contains and is contained in the leſs general.—This explained by the diſtinction betwixt containing* potentially *and* actually.—*This diſtinction ſhewn to apply to all propoſitions, whether praedicating the genus of the ſpecies, or the accident of the ſubſtance.—Propoſitions alone not fit for ſcience.—There muſt be that compariſon of propoſitions, which we call* Reaſoning.—*Where the connection betwixt the two Terms of the propoſition is not evident, it muſt be made ſo by other propoſitions.—This cannot go on in* infinitum, *but muſt ſtop at ſelf-evident propoſitions.—Of the proceſs of reaſoning from theſe propoſitions, and of the collection of propoſitions into Syllogiſm.—Of the wonderful invention of the Syllogiſm, and of the whole logical works of Ariſtotle.—Syllogiſm alone not ſufficient for Science.—There muſt be alſo Definition.—Of the nature of Definition.—The Terms of propoſitions may conſiſt of ſeveral ideas, expreſſed by ſeveral words.—This illuſtrated by the example of the firſt axiom of Euclid.—Definitions, therefore, as well as Axioms, neceſſary for Science.—Of the utility of Logic, and the neceſſity that a man, who pretends to be learned in any ſcience, ſhould know what Science is.*—Opinion *among men, prior to ſcience or demonſtration.—All men, when they firſt begin to think, form Opinions,—and moſt men never go farther.—Polybius's definition of Man,* that he is an opinion-forming

forming animal.—*This not ſo good a definition as Ariſtotle's.—Ariſtotle gives us a ſyſtem of reaſoning from Popular Opinions, which he calls Dialectics; and with this, and his treatiſe* De Sophiſticis Elenchis, *he concludes his great work of Logic.—Summary of this work.*

BUT before I proceed to ſpeak of the invention of language and other arts, I think it is proper to ſhew the progreſs of the human mind from *ideas* to *ſcience*. What ideas are, and how they are formed by intellect, I hope I have explained, to the ſatisfaction of the reader, in the preceding chapter. But ideas are only the materials of ſcience; and in order to know what ſcience is, we muſt know how thoſe materials are put together ſo as to produce ſcience.

The firſt ſtep from ideas towards ſcience, is Propoſitions, which are formed, by comparing one idea with another; ſo that, from the comparative, or Logical faculty, as Ariſtotle calls it, which we have in common with the better kind of brutes, not only our ideas proceed, but ſcience, and, in general, all the operations of the intellectual mind *. When we compare our ideas, we perceive, as Mr Locke tells us, their agreement or diſagreement: But wherein this agreement conſiſts, he has not told us; nor can any man tell, who has not ſtudied the antient philoſophy. But that philoſophy teaches us, that in every propoſition there is one idea more general than another, and that this more general idea either contains or comprehends the leſs general, or does not: And thus are formed affirmative and negative propoſitions. The more general idea, which

* See what I have ſaid of this logical or comparative faculty of the human mind, in the firſt chapter of this volume, and in vol. I. p. 381.

which contains the leſs general, is called the *Predicate* of the propoſition; whereas the leſs general is called the *Subject*. But this diſtinction, however obvious, and ſuch, as that, without it, we cannot have ſo much as the idea of a Propoſition, Mr Locke has no where made; ſo totally ignorant he appears to have been of logic *.

But to thoſe, who know no more of logic nor of antient philoſophy than Mr Locke did, it will be neceſſary to explain in what ſenſe one idea can be ſaid to contain another, or the idea leſs general can b ſaid to be a part of the more general. And, in the firſt place, it is not in the ſenſe that one body is ſaid to be a part of another, or the greater body to contain the leſſer; nor is it as one number is ſaid to contain another; but it is *virtually* or *potentially* that the more general idea contains the leſs general. In this way the genus contains the ſpecies; for the genus may be predicated of every ſpecies under it, whether exiſting or not exiſting; ſo that *virtually* it contains all the ſpecieſes under it, which exiſt or may exiſt. And not only does the more general contain the leſs general, but (what at firſt ſight may appear ſurpriſing) the leſs general contains the more general, not *virtually* or *potentially*, but *actually*. Thus the genus Animal contains *virtually* Man, and every other ſpecies of animal either exiſting or that may exiſt: But the genus Animal is contained in man, and in other animals *actually*; for man cannot exiſt without being in *actuality*, and not *potentially* only, an animal †.

There are only two ways in which the more general idea of a pro-

* See what I have further ſaid of Mr Locke's logic, in vol. I. of this work, p. 382. and following.

† See Book V. Chap. II. of vol. I. where this matter is explained at great length, and particularly p. 479. where I have acknowledged that I got the diſtinction betwixt containing potentially and actually, upon which I think, the whole truth of the Syllogiſm depends, from a Greek now living, *Eugenius Diaconus*.

poſition can be predicated of the leſs general: One of theſe is, as the genus is predicated of the ſpecies, which I have already mentioned. It is called by Ariſtotle *καθ' ὑποκειμενου* *. The other Ariſtotle calls *εν ὑποκειμενῳ*, when an accident is predicated of a ſubſtance, which is, when it is affirmed that the accident is inherent in the ſubſtance; as when we predicate the colour *white* of *man*. In this caſe likewiſe the predicate is a more general idea than the ſubject, containing not only *man* in the inſtance given, but every other ſubſtance of that colour. And the ſame diſtinction will apply of containing *virtually* and *actually*: For *white* contains man only *virtually*, but is contained in man *actually*; ſo that what I have ſaid of ideas containing and not containing one another, applies equally to all propoſitions predicating either the genus of the ſpecies, or the accident of the ſubſtance; † and this may ſuffice, as to propoſitions in general, for our preſent purpoſe. Who would deſire to know more upon this ſubject, may conſult the fifth book of the firſt volume of this work, where he will find the whole doctrine of propoſitions explained on the principles of Antient Philoſophy.

But propoſitions alone will not make ſcience. For ſuppoſe that we cannot perceive the connection betwixt the two ideas, in the propoſition, nor diſcover that the one makes part of the other; what is to be done in that caſe? This Ariſtotle tells us, and not any other philoſopher antient or modern, that I know. We muſt find out, he ſays, a third idea, which we muſt apply to each of the ideas in the propoſition, and which, therefore, he very properly calls a middle term; and, in this way, try to diſcover the connection betwixt the two ideas in the propoſition. This operation of the intellect, by which we apply the middle term to the two ideas or terms of the propoſition, and by which we form other propoſitions, is called

* See the beginning of the Book of Categories.

† See, with reſpect to theſe two kinds of Predication, vol. I. p. 383.

led in Greek διανοια, in Latin *diſcurſus mentis*, and in Engliſh *Reaſoning*; or, as the Latin expreſſion may not be improperly tranſlated, *Diſcourſe of Reaſon*. And the way, in which the two terms are connected by the middle term, is this. If the predicate, or greater term of the propoſition to be proved, contain the middle term, and if the middle term contain the ſubject, or leſſer term, then the predicate muſt neceſſarily contain the ſubject; and thus an *affirmative* propoſition is proved. But, on the other hand, if the predicate do not contain the middle term, but the middle term contain the leſſer term of the propoſition to be proved, then it is proved that the predicate does not contain the ſubject; and this is the demonſtration of a *negative* propoſition.

But ſuppoſe two propoſitions, by which we apply the middle term firſt to one idea of the propoſition to be proved and then to the other, are not ſufficient to diſcover the connection of the two propoſitions; what is then to be done? And I ſay, more propoſitions muſt be diſcovered, by which the two terms of the propoſitions to be proved are to be connected together. But is this to go on *in infinitum?* If this were the caſe, there could be no demonſtration, or ſcience of any kind; for, if every thing was to be proved, nothing could be proved. There muſt, therefore, be ſome propoſitions, which require no proof: Theſe are called *axioms* or ſelf-evident propoſitions; in which, by the ſame faculty that enables us to form ideas, I mean the intellect, we diſcover the neceſſary connection betwixt the two terms *.

And here it is evident, that before we can arrive at ſelf-evident propoſitions, many other propoſitions muſt be formed, and all theſe muſt be arranged, and put together in ſuch an order as to make demonſtration or ſcience. To know how to do this is itſelf a great ſcience; the greateſt, I think, that ever was diſcovered by man.

* See, upon the ſubject of Axioms, vol. I. p. 389, and following.

It is called Logic; of which Ariſtotle, and he only, has given us a ſyſtem; and as all ſcience muſt begin with an analyſis, he has given us a moſt wonderful analyſis of the operations of the human mind; beginning with ſimple terms; then proceeding to propoſitions; from thence to the collection of theſe propoſitions, which he calls very properly *Syllogiſm*, and which is the laſt work of demonſtration.

When we conſider the infinite variety of ſubjects, upon which men reaſon, how this infinity is bounded, and limits ſet to it by the book upon the Categories, which reduce to claſſes and numbers the whole things of this univerſe, and without which there could have been no ſcience of logic, as there can be no ſcience of infinity;—when we conſider alſo the variety of propoſitions, formed of the ideas contained in the Categories, and the ſeveral ſpecieſes of them produced by the differences of the predicate and ſubject, the matter and manner of the propoſition, all enumerated by Ariſtotle and his Commentators to the number of 3024; a number that muſt appear incredible to thoſe who have never thought upon the ſubject;—and when we join to all this, the analyſis of the ſyllogiſms compoſed of theſe propoſitions into three figures and 14 modes, we muſt acknowledge, that Ariſtotle's Logic is the moſt wonderful ſyſtem of ſcience that ever was invented; ſuch as could not have been invented by one man, even a man of ſuch a genius as Ariſtotle, but muſt have been the invention of a ſucceſſion of men from father to ſon for many generations, conſtantly employed in the cultivation of arts and ſciences. Such a ſucceſſion never was in any other country than Egypt; and which, therefore, I hold to be the parent country of all arts and ſciences *.

But even Syllogiſm is not ſufficient for demonſtrative reaſoning; for there muſt be likewiſe *Definition*, by which we know exactly the nature

* See page 54, and following of the preface to the III. vol. likewiſe p. 45. of the ſame preface, where I have enlarged much upon the wonderful invention of logic, and the utility of it.

nature of the ſubjects that we join together in propoſitions: For unleſs we know with the greateſt accuracy the meaning of the words that we employ to expreſs our ideas, it is impoſſible that we can demonſtrate. And here we return again to the doctrine of ideas, and the diviſion of them into genus and ſpecies, ſubſtance and accident; one of which two diviſions muſt be expreſſed in the definition, according to the nature of the ſubject.

And here it is to be obſerved, that a ſingle predicate or ſubject of a propoſition may be expreſſed by ſeveral words. Of this the firſt Axiom of Euclid, and which one may think ſhould be a very ſimple propoſition, That *things, which are equal to the ſame thing, are equal to one another*, may furniſh us an example. For there *the equality of things to one another*, is predicated of *things equal to the ſame thing:* Where both the predicate and the ſubject are ideas compounded of ſeveral ideas, and expreſſed by ſeveral words*.

Thus it appears, that definitions, as well as axioms, are neceſſary for ſcience; and, therefore, Euclid has prefixed to his Syſtem of Geometry, both definitions and axioms.

And here I would adviſe a man, who deſires to learn the art of reaſoning, to ſtudy the Elements of Euclid, before he applies to the Logic of Ariſtotle: For in Euclid he will readily perceive the progreſs of the mind from propoſitions ſelf-evident to propoſitions that need to be demonſtrated; and this upon ſubjects the moſt ſimple of any that are the ſubject of ſcience and the leaſt removed from the perceptions of ſenſe, being lines and figures, which are repreſented to the ſight, not like other ſubjects of ſcience to be comprehended only by intellect. The method Euclid follows in his demonſtrations is called the *Synthetic* Method, by which he proceeds from ſelf-evident propoſitions, or propoſitions before demonſtrated,

to

* Vol. I. p. 391. and following.

to the theorem, or problem, which is propoſed to be demonſtrated. But I would adviſe the ſtudent of geometry, not only to follow that method, but to reverſe it, and practice what is called *the analytic* method, which begins where the other method ends, that is with the propoſition to be demonſtrated; and inquires whether that propoſition be not neceſſarily connected with ſome ſelf-evident propoſition, or ſome propoſition, one or more, that had been before demonſtrated: So that, as it begins where the other method ends, it ends where the other method begins. And I am perſuaded, that, in this analytical way, the truth of the propoſitions, which Euclid has demonſtrated, was firſt diſcovered: For analyſis is the beginning of all ſcience: And by going thus forward and backward in the demonſtration, the young ſtudent more perfectly comprehends the truth of it.

It was the application of reaſoning to ſubjects ſo ſimple as to be preſented to the eyes, which I am perſuaded determined the Pythagoreans to make geometry the firſt ſtudy of their ſcholars; for they thought it was teaching them in the eaſieſt way, to know what demonſtration was. And, further, they thought that it was the eaſieſt and moſt natural way of raiſing the mind from objects of ſenſe to things immaterial, which have a real and permanent exiſtence; and, therefore, were called by theſe philoſophers the τα οντως οντα, whereas things material, are always changing, and in a conſtant viciſſitude of generation and corruption, ſo that a material thing was ſaid by them to be always *becoming* ſomething, but never to be *actually* any thing: By which circumlocution we only can render in Engliſh what they expreſſed in two words, ουκ εστι αλλα γιγνεται. It was for this reaſon that geometry, and arithmetic were called Μαθηματα, as teaching men to reaſon, and to raiſe their minds above the perceptions of ſenſe, which was the chief object of that exalted philoſophy. But a man, in thoſe days, would have been thought ridiculous, who, becauſe he underſtood lines and figures,

thought

thought himſelf a philoſopher, even though he had joined to the knowledge of geometry, the ſcience of numbers, which was alſo very carefully taught in the Pythagorean ſchool. It was only by the ſtudy of morals, natural philoſophy, metaphyſics, and theology, that a man in that ſchool could deſerve the name of a philoſopher. Theſe ſtudies, however, of geometry and arithmetic, were held to be very proper preparatives for philoſophy; and, I think I may add, for logic, though even logic by thoſe philoſophers was not held to be, properly ſpeaking, philoſophy, but only an *organ* of philoſophy.

As to the utility of logic, I need only repeat what I have ſaid in more than one place of this work, That no man can ever know what ſcience is without ſtudying the logic of Ariſtotle, and muſt reaſon as a child reaſons, or as an unlearned man ſpeaks, without knowing the principles of the art, or being able to tell why one argument is concluſive and another not *. It is, therefore, ſurpriſing, that any man ſhould pretend to be learned in any ſcience, who does not ſo much as know what ſcience is.

But, in the progreſs from ſenſations to ſcience, there is a ſtep which is neceſſary, and has been made by all men before they attained to ſcience, and that is *opinion*, which is not like the concluſions of ſcience neceſſarily true, but may be either true or falſe, as it happens. All men, when they firſt begin to think, muſt form *opinions*, particularly concerning what is good or ill in human life. And by far the greater part of mankind, as they never attain to ſcience, have only opinions by which they are governed. And, therefore, when Polybius has ſaid, that man is Ζωον δοξοποιητικον, that is *an opinion-forming animal*, he has given a very good definition

* See the paſſage above quoted from the preface to third volume of this work. See alſo vol. I. book V. chap. IV. where the nature of the ſyllogiſm and its uſefulneſs are explained at great length. See alſo vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 47. and following.

tion of a great plurality of the human ſpecies, but not ſo good a definition as Ariſtotle has given, which takes in the whole ſpecies, and marks the progreſs of Man, from the mere ſenſitive animal to the perfection of his nature by intellect and ſcience, of which progreſs Polybius in his definition has only mentioned one ſtep.

But as opinions are ſo prevalent among men, and govern the lives of ſo great a majority of them, it was fit that Ariſtotle ſhould teach us, in this great logical work of his, not only how to argue, from ſelf-evident propoſitions, and ſo demonſtrate, but alſo how to argue from the common opinions of men, and in that way perſuade men, who do not ſo much as know what demonſtration is.

And, here we may admire the admirable order and economy of this great work. Firſt he begins with ſimple terms, arranged and divided into ten claſſes: And this is the ſubject of his firſt book upon logic, entitled *Categories*. In the ſecond book, entitled περὶ ἑρμηνείας, or *Of Interpretation*, he proceeds to treat of propoſitions, which he has divided in the wonderful manner above mentioned. His third logical work is entitled the *Firſt Analytics*, in which he treats of the form of the ſyllogiſm, and ſhows us how the propoſitions are to be arranged and connected together, ſo that the concluſion muſt neceſſarily follow from the premiſſes. But that is not demonſtration, becauſe the premiſſes may be falſe; and then the concluſion will be falſe alſo. But, in his *Second Analytics*, he proceeds to ſhow, how not only the form of the ſyllogiſm may be regular, but the concluſion of it made true and certain. And, in this way, he accompliſhes what he profeſſes to be the deſign of the whole work*; namely, to ſhow us what ſcience and demonſtration is. And he concludes this *magnum opus*, the greateſt work of ſcience that ever was executed, with the work above mentioned, upon *Popular Argumentation*, or reaſoning

* In the beginning of his Firſt Analytics.

reaſoning from opinions, which he entitles *Dialectic* *, to which he ſubjoins a treatiſe, *De Sophiſticis Elenchis*, where he ſhows how the captious arguments of the ſophiſts of thoſe times were to be refuted.

And thus he concludes his *Logical Work*, conſiſting of ſix treatiſes, in which he has ſhown us not only what *Science* is, but what *Art* is; for nothing deſerves the name of art, which is not founded upon principles of ſcience: So that, in this work, we have explained to us the principles of all arts and ſciences.

And, now I think I have fully explained Ariſtotle's definition of Man, by ſhowing not only what it is that he makes the genus of this definition, namely, *a Logical Animal*, but alſo by ſhowing the progreſs from that logical or comparative faculty, which Man has in common with the better kind of brutes, to the operation of intellect in forming ideas, and then his progreſs from ideas to ſcience, where his progreſs in this life ends. If all this can be better done or done at all, upon other principles than thoſe which the antient philoſophy furniſhes, I ſhall acknowledge that Mr Harris and I have beſtowed our time to very little purpoſe upon the ſtudy of that philoſophy. But if, on the other hand, that cannot be done, the greateſt admirers of the modern philoſophy muſt confeſs, that, without the aſſiſtance of the Ancients, we cannot ſo much as tell what ſort of animal we ourſelves are: And if we do not know what *man* is, it is impoſſible, as I have elſewhere obſerved, that we can know any thing of God or ſuperior intelligences †.

* See Vol. VI. of the Origin of Language, Book I. Chap. III. in which I have treated very fully of the Dialectic of Ariſtotle, and ſhown that he has the honour of the invention of that art.

† Page 7. and 8. of this volume.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the neceſſity of arts and of ſciences and a regular polity among Men.—Without theſe, men cannot be happy though aſſociated; and in certain circumſtances may be moſt miſerable.—This proved by the example of the people of Paraguay in South America.—Of the two Authors, Charlevoix and Muratori, who give us the hiſtory of this people.—The laſt may be thought the more credible hiſtorian; but Charlevoix's Narrative well vouched.—The country of Paraguay of prodigious extent.—The inhabitants of it living under no government, not even the family government, except in time of war;—the moſt ſavage and brutal people we read of;—no faith or honeſty among them, nor ſenſe of the Pulchrum *and* Honeſtum;—*addicted to the uſe of ſtrong liquors, which made them ſtill more barbarous;—very dull and ſtupid when the Jeſuits came among them, but capable of being taught;—more diſeaſed than any civiliſed people.—This accounted for.—Example of other men who have lived in a brutiſh manner, but not ſo brutiſh as the Paraguaiſe before they were civiliſed.—Of the hardſhips and dangers the Jeſuits went through in civiliſing them.—Had the greateſt difficulty to get at ſeveral of theſe nations, through deſarts and foreſts.—Had their languages to learn;—and their Sorcerers and Magicians to encounter.—Their greateſt obſtacle was their apprehenſion of the Spaniards making Slaves of them when they were Chriſtians.—Of the martyrdom the Jeſuits ſuffered, to the number of 30.—Of the oppoſition they met with from the Spaniſh noblemen who governed the commanderies.—Notwithſtanding all theſe obſtacles, the Jeſuits in the beginning of this century had eſtabliſhed 30 Miſſions.—The greateſt order and good government in all thoſe miſſions.—The Jeſuits did not chuſe that the number in any of their miſſions*

miſſions ſhould exceed 6,000, *as they thought great numbers could not be well governed;—were very attentive to the education of the youth, teaching them all the uſeful arts of life.—Nothing the Savages learnt ſo well as muſic;—learned the uſe of arms, and performed great actions both againſt the Indians and Portugueſe;—not deſerted by the Jeſuits when in the field.—Oppoſition given to the arming them with fire arms.—Of the diviſion of property among them.—No money allowed among them.—Were made moſt zealous Chriſtians.—Became Apoſtles themſelves, and ſuffered martyrdom.—An account of their happy ſtate, given in a letter by the Governor of Paraguay to the King.—The love they bore to their teachers, and their teachers to them.—Of the methods by which the reformation was brought about.—*1ſt, *By Religion:—The Indians tamed and civiliſed by the Jeſuits, in the ſame manner as the Greeks were by Orpheus.—*2dly, *By Muſic, in the way that Amphion civiliſed the Greeks:—The Jeſuits may alſo be compared to Prometheus.—*3tio, *By Government the Indians were civiliſed.—Without government Man an imperfect animal.—Obſervations upon the Men of Paraguay in their wild ſtate.—The ſtate of civiliſation and government abſolutely neceſſary to make men live in an orderly way.—The Paraguaiſe wanting theſe, and having the uſe of ſtrong liquors, the wildeſt people that we have ever heard of.—No ſenſe in them of the* Pulchrum *and* Honeſtum, *which cannot be, but where there is government.—Of the diſeaſes to which they are liable; and the reaſons why they are ſo much diſeaſed. Of the difference betwixt them and the inhabitants of the Pelew-Iſlands, and the New Zealanders.—Of the methods uſed by the Jeſuits to civiliſe them; and firſt Religion.—This natural to man.—All men who have the leaſt uſe of reaſon, muſt be convinced that beings ſuperior to man exiſt:—Theſe beings they will obey.—It was not by teaching only that the Jeſuits made Chriſtians of the Indians, but by a worſhip of pomp and ſhow.—Of their proceſſions and triumphal Arches.—A particular deſcription of them.—*

Muſic, a great part of the Religion, to which the Indians were converted.—Of the natural power of Muſic over man; without it the Savages of Paraguay could not have been converted.—The laſt method the Jeſuits uſed, was the eſtabliſhment of a good Government among them.—This was a Religious Government.—The beſt Government in Antient times, ſuch as the Heroic Government in Greece, was connected with Religion.—The ſtory of the civiliſation of theſe Savages, a renewal of the Hiſtory of Antient times.—To be conſidered, whether Religion be not as neceſſary for continuing good Government among men, as for introducing it.—Of the diſperſion of the Jeſuits;—a great blow to learning;—compared to the diſperſion of the Pythagorean Colleges in Magna Graecia.—Of the noviciate of 15 years, the Jeſuits went through before they were admitted into the order;—were not only taught themſelves, but teached others;—after they were admitted, they were diſpoſed of by the ſuperior of the order according to their different geniuſes.—Not known what is become of the Miſſions in Paraguay after the diſſolution of the order of Jeſuits.—Their parting with their Diſciples moſt ſorrowful.—If they had not choſen to leave them, the power of Spain could not have forced them.—Might have eſtabliſhed many more Miſſions,—and made a new Empire, and a new World of Learning in that Country.

HAVING explained in the preceding chapters the operations of the Human Intellect, firſt in forming ideas, and then of theſe ideas, arts, and ſciences, the reader would naturally expect that, in this Hiſtory of Man, I ſhould proceed to ſhow in what country or countries theſe arts and ſciences had a beginning, and where firſt a regular polity was formed, without which no progreſs could be made in them. But, before I proceed to this moſt important part of the Hiſtory of Man, I think it will not be improper to ſhow the neceſſity of theſe inventions, and that without them men, though

aſſociated,

aſſociated, cannot be happy in any circumſtances or ſituation; but, in certain circumſtances, may be moſt miſerable, and at the ſame time the wildeſt and moſt ſavage animal on this earth. This I will ſhow, by the example of a people in South America, known by the name of Paraguaiſe; from whoſe hiſtory we may alſo learn this moſt important leſſon, how men are to be recovered from ſo deſperate a ſtate, and arts and civility introduced among them. It is an event, the moſt remarkable, I think, in modern hiſtory; and we have an account of it from two authors, firſt *Charlevoix* the Jeſuit, who has given a very full and circumſtantial account of it in three quarto volumes; and then *Muratori*, who has given us a ſhort, but very diſtinct account of the civiliſing, or as it may be called, the humaniſing of thoſe ſavages. His hiſtory I conſider as an excellent abridgment of Charlevoix, though it was publiſhed ſeveral years before Charlevoix's work; and by many he will be thought an author more worthy of credit, as he was no Jeſuit, whereas Charlevoix, as I have ſaid, was a Jeſuit, and on that account may be thought partial to his brethern of that order, who were the principal actors in this great work of making men and chriſtians of the moſt ſavage people that I believe ever exiſted. But, he has ſupported the truth of his hiſtory by copies of original writings, which he has ſubjoined to his 2d and 3d volumes, under the name of *Pieces Juſtificatives*; nor do I think that there is any good reaſon to doubt of any of the facts he relates, unleſs, perhaps, the miracles, which he ſays were wrought for the converſion of the ſavages, and which, whether true or falſe, it was proper they ſhould believe.

The country of Paraguay, as deſcribed by Charlevoix, is of prodigious extent; ſtretching all the way from the lake *Xarcies*, where the river Paraguay riſes, (which gives its name to the people), along that river, and as far ſouth as the Straits of Magellan, and bounded by Brazil

Brazil upon the eaſt, and upon the weſt by Peru and Chili *. It is inhabited by a great number of ſmall nations: For, into ſuch, men at firſt aſſociated; and it was only in proceſs of time that great nations were formed. All theſe nations were in a ſtate of the greateſt barbarity when the Jeſuits came among them, excepting only the *Manaſicas*, who, from the account which Charlevoix gives of them †, appear to have had ſome civility and government among them: But all the reſt of them had no kind of government at all, not even family government. They lived in the Cyclopian way, in detached families, but of which the father had no authority over his children, who had ſuch abhorrence of all conſtraint or obedience to ſuperiors, that they had no regard to the commands of either father or mother. Theſe families, however, when they went to war with any of their neighbours, aſſociated together, under a chief who was called a *Cacique*, but who had no authority except while the war laſted ‡. None of them practiſed any kind of agriculture; and all of them lived chiefly by hunting and the fleſh diet, of which they were ſo ravenous, that they ate of it as often as they could find it, as tygers and lions do: So that, as Muratori tells us, it was with the greateſt difficulty, that their inſtructors, the Jeſuits, could perſuade them to make regular meals ſuch as Europeans make. They were Canibals too, and the worſt of that kind we have ever heard of. The New Zealanders eat only their enemies, as the Indians of North America formerly did, and as ſome of them, far removed from any commerce with the Europeans, do at this day; but the Savages of Paraguay ate their countrymen and friends, when they could ſurpriſe and catch them. In ſhort, men were their prey as much as the beaſts of the field are ours §; and human fleſh being, as I have obſerved,

* Charlevoix's Hiſtory of Paraguay, vol. I. p. 7.

† Ibid. vol. II. p. 274.

‡ Ibid. vol. I. p. 191, and 192.

§ Muratori, p. 26.

ſerved*, very delicious, they appear to have preferred it to all other; and Charlevoix mentions a Cacique who made it his ordinary diet †. And not only did they eat men when they could get them, but they ate other animals of prey, ſuch as tygers ‡, which no other animal of prey does. Monkies too they ate; and ſuch was their paſſion for animal food, that they ate worms, moles, vipers, and reptiles of every kind §. There was no faith nor honeſty in them, nor had they any ſenſe of the *Pulchrum* and *Honeſtum* in actions or ſentiments, which, as Polybius has very well obſerved, only comes after men are civiliſed, and live under a regular government.

Their barbarous diſpoſitions were inflamed and made much more brutal by the uſe of a fermented liquor, which they made of rice, and called *chica*. For they were ſo unhappy, that though they had not learned the common arts of life, they had invented, or what I rather believe to be the truth, had learned from the Spaniards the art of making this intoxicating liquor; of which they drank to ſuch exceſs, that, in their drunkenneſs, they did things which Charlevoix does not chuſe to mention.

As to their genius and natural parts, Charlevoix tell us, that when the Jeſuits came among them they were quite dull, and unable to comprehend any thing that they could not perceive by their ſenſes; ſo that the Jeſuits were in doubt, whether they ought to admit them to the participation of any ſacrament, except that of baptiſm, and conſulted their ſuperiors the Biſhops upon the ſubject: But they were ſoon convinced that they had the capacity, when properly taught, of learning any thing ‖.

I

* Page 62. of this volume.

† Charlevoix, vol. I. p. 365.

‡ Ibid. p. 387.

§ Ibid.

‖ Ibid. p. 240. and 241.

I will mention only one thing more concerning theſe nations: It is what may appear very ſurpriſing at firſt ſight to thoſe of my readers who have been informed, and truly informed, that barbarous nations are much more healthy than the civiliſed, whereas the nations of Paraguay are more diſeaſed than any civiliſed people we read of. For, according to the account Charlevoix gives of them, they are liable to more peſtilential and epidemic diſeaſes than any other people upon the face of the earth, and not only grown people among them die of thoſe diſeaſes, but there is a great mortality among their children; ſo great, that their ſorcerers and magicians imputed it to the baptiſm which the Jeſuits adminiſtered to them. But when we conſider what I have ſaid of their manner of living, devouring ſo much fleſh, and drinking ſo much of intoxicating liquor, it is rather ſurpriſing that they are not more depopulated or altogether extinguiſhed.

Upon the whole, though we read of many nations, who in antient times lived in a brutiſh manner, copulating promiſcuouſly, even ſuch nations as in later times became moſt learned and polite, ſuch as the Athenians, among whom Cecrops firſt inſtituted marriage, from whence he had the name of διφυης, yet there is no example in antient or modern hiſtory of men ſo extremely barbarous, ſo wicked, and ſo much worſe than any brutes, as the inhabitants of Paraguay were, before they were tamed and humaniſed by the Jeſuits.

Theſe fathers began their operations among them about the beginning of laſt century; and ſuffered hardſhips, and encountered dangers, in the proſecution of their deſign to civiliſe and make chriſtians of them, ſuch as could not be credited, if they were not very well

well atteſted. In the firſt place, they had the greateſt difficulty to get acceſs to ſome of theſe nations, which never had been conquered by the Spainards, and were hardly known to them. For this purpoſe, they were obliged to travel through pathleſs deſerts for hundreds of miles, and to cut their way with axes through foreſts otherwiſe unpenetrable even by foot paſſengers. And, when they came among them, they had their language to learn, which was very different in the different nations. Then they had their Sorcerers and Magicians to encounter, who would very naturally oppoſe ſuch an innovation in the religion of the country, as the Jeſuits propoſed to make. But their greateſt obſtacle of all was the hatred of thoſe nations to the Spainards, who had made ſlaves of ſo many of them, after converting them to chriſtianity, and who they ſuppoſed intended to make ſlaves of them all when they were converted. It was this chiefly which raiſed the ſpirit of the people againſt them, who, headed by their Caciques, perſecuted the Jeſuits wherever they could find them, and beſtowed upon many of them, to the number of above 30, as Muratori ſays, (more than a third I believe of all thoſe who were employed in thoſe miſſions), the crown of martyrdom, which they appeared to deſire rather than to ſhun; and one of them, mentioned by Charlevoix, of the name of Lizardi, was in a tranſport of joy upon the hopes he had of ending his life in that way, and which accordingly happened *.

A greater obſtacle I believe to the ſucceſs of the Jeſuits than any I have mentioned, was the oppoſition of the Spaniſh Noblemen, who governed in South America certain diſtricts called Commanderies, in which they made thoſe Indians, converted to chriſtianity, ſerve them as ſlaves: Whereas the Jeſuits made all thoſe of their miſſions, or Reductions as they called them, free men as well as chriſtians, knowing ſo much of the diſpoſition of the Indians, that if they were

* Charlevoix, vol. III. p. 168.

to purchaſe chriſtianity at the expence of their liberty, they never could make any conſiderable number of converts. Theſe Noblemen not only made all the intereſt they could againſt them at the Court of Madrid, but ſtirred up againſt them the Spaniſh Biſhops in South America; by one of whom, and the mob he raiſed againſt them, they were driven out of the town of Aſcenſion, the capital of Paraguay.

But notwithſtanding the perſecutions of Infidels, and the loſs thereby of ſo many of their number, and notwithſtanding the oppoſition of avaricious and intereſted chriſtians, the Jeſuits were ſo ſucceſsful, that they had eſtabliſhed in Paraguay, and the neighbouring countries, in the beginning of this century, 30 Reductions, containing each between 4000 and 6000 people. But neither Muratori, who publiſhed his work in 1743, nor Charlevoix who publiſhed in 1756, tell us how many there were when they wrote. But there is one, Florentine, a Capuchine quoted by Muratori *, who ſays that, in 1712, when he wrote, there were above 100 towns built, all inhabited by chriſtians; by which I do not underſtand that they were all miſſions of the Jeſuits, but towns inhabited, partly by Spainards, and partly by converted Indians.

The order and good government eſtabliſhed by the Jeſuits, in thoſe miſſions, was wonderful as it is deſcribed by Charlevoix. The fathers had the direction and ſuperintendency of the whole: But they had officers under them, who took care that all their orders were punctually executed; ſo that I do not believe there ever was a private family more regularly governed than theſe little ſtates. For they did not chuſe that their miſſions ſhould conſiſt of great numbers, or of any number exceeding 6000: And in that they imitated

* Page 289.

ed the wiſdom of the antient philoſophers, particularly Ariſtotle, who did not think it was poſſible to govern well any very great community; and, therefore, he limited the number of the citizens in his commonwealth to the number, as I remember, of 10,000.

They beſtowed the greateſt pains on the education of their Neophytes, as they called the new converted chriſtians, inſtructing them, with the greateſt care, in all the uſeful arts of life; and particularly agriculture, which they learned from the Jeſuits themſelves, who taught them the uſe of the plough and ſpade, to ſow and to reap, working themſelves with them *. They had ſhops and work houſes where they were taught the mechanic arts, ſuch as the arts of carpenters, ſmiths and even painters, of ſculptors and guilders and likewiſe of clock-makers: And the children were applied to thoſe different trades, according as their genius and inclination ſeemed to direct; for, as Charlevoix has obſerved, art ought to be directed by nature †. They had ſchools alſo where they were taught reading and writing, and alſo arithmetic, which went no farther among them, while in their ſavage ſtate, than to count as far as *twenty*, the number of their fingers and toes. They taught them alſo, the art of building, ſo that they not only built churches for themſelves, but ornamented them in very good taſte with paintings and engravings ‡. The women alſo were taught all the arts proper for their ſex, ſuch as ſpinning and weaving §.

In all theſe arts, according to the accounts of which Charlevoix and Muratori have given us, they made great proficiency; but in none, I think ſo much, as in muſic; for which they ſhowed ſuch

* Charlevoix, vol. I. p. 242.
† Ibid.
‡ Ibid.
§ Ibid. p. 243.

a wonderful genius, that, as Charlevoix ſays, one ſhould think, they ſung like birds, by inſtinct *; which confirms an obſervation I have made in more than one place, that muſic is much more natural to man than articulation, which is very difficult to be learned, and can hardly be learned at all, except when we are very young.

Nor were the fathers content to teach thoſe Savages the arts of civil life; but they made ſoldiers of them, and the beſt militia in that part of the world: For they were not only a match for the Indians, and particularly a barbarous nation among them they called *Mamelus*, who infeſted the Spaniſh dominions very much, but even for the regular diſciplined troops of the Portugueſe, whom they defeated more than once. And when they made priſoners of them, they treated them with great humanity; particularly upon one occaſion, when the proviſions failed them in a long march, they divided what they had with their Portugueſe priſoners, gave them mules to carry them to the neareſt of their Reductions, and guides to ſhow them the way †. The ſeveral Reductions furniſhed, upon one occaſion, 6000 men, when the Spainards could only furniſh 800 ‡: And, upon another occaſion, 4000 of them, with only 300 Spainards, took by aſſault a very ſtrong place belonging to the Portugueſe, and very obſtinately defended by them §. And all this ſervice they performed to the King of Spain, at their own expence, receiving no pay, and furniſhing their own arms and proviſions ‖. And, upon one occaſion, they refuſed the reward that was offered them by the Spaniſh general for their good ſervices ¶.

Nor

* Charlevoix, vol. I. p. 257.
† vol. II. p. 187.
‡ vol. III. p. 73.
§ vol. II. p. 194.—199.
‖ Ibid. p. 199.
¶ Ibid. p. 261.

Nor did their faithful paſtors deſert them when they took the field, but attended them even in their battles; and when any of them fell, they went to them expoſing themſelves to the greateſt danger from the fire of the enemy, in order to give them all the comfort they could while they were dying *.

But even in forming this militia, without which, I am perſuaded, the Spainards in that part of the world muſt have been conquered by the Portugueſe or Indians, they met with great oppoſition from their enemies both in the Court of Madrid and in India, and it was with great difficulty that they obtained the permiſſion of giving the uſe of fire arms to their Neophytes, without which they could have been of little ſervice.

As to property in their little ſtates, there was not an entire community of goods in them, nor was it all private property; but the Jeſuits followed a middle way which I think better than either. Every man had a portion of ground allotted him, which he cultivated for himſelf: But there was a great track of ground ſet apart for the public, which was cultivated by the whole community, and the fruits given to every man who needed it; ſo that they enjoyed the great bleſſing, that Agur prayed for, *of neither poverty nor riches.*

As to riches, theſe Jeſuit legiſlators adopted a moſt valuable part of the policy of Lycurgus, who forebade the uſe of money among his citizens. Commerce, therefore, in the miſſions, was carried on in the moſt antient and I believe beſt way, by exchange.

While the Neophytes were thus employed in the arts both of peace and war, religion was not neglected among them; but, on the contrary,

* Vol. II. p. 286.

trary, they were moſt aſſiduous and punctual in the diſcharge of all their duties as chriſtians; nor do I believe that in the preſent age there are or have been, in any country, more zealous and fervent diſciples of Chriſt. They became at laſt apoſtles themſelves, and laboured much in the converſion of their barbarous neighbours; ſome of them, Charlevoix tells us, in that ſervice ſuffered even martyrdom *.

In ſhort the people, who were collected by the Jeſuits in thoſe miſſions, were entirely changed, and, from the wildeſt of all barbarians of whom we read, were become tame, gentle, orderly and regular in their life and conduct, and practiſing every virtue belonging to human nature. This is atteſted in a letter written by the governor of Paraguay to the King of Spain, of which Charlevoix has given us the contents †, wherein he ſays, 'That he had viſited all the 'reductions in his province; and that he found them all in a ſtate, 'which could not be believed by any who had not ſeen it with his 'own eyes: That nothing could be added to the policy and good 'order in which they lived, to the innocence of their manners, and 'the piety and union among them: That the tender affection and re-'ſpect, which they ſhowed for their paſtors, could not be expreſſed; 'and that every one of them was diſpoſed to ſacrifice with pleaſure 'his life, and all that he poſſeſſed in the world, for the ſervice of 'God and his Majeſty'. To this account of them I will only add, that as the greateſt pleaſure we enjoy in this life, is to love and to be loved, the Indians of thoſe miſſions enjoyed that pleaſure in a very high degree, loving, as they did, their governors, and being ſo much beloved by them, a thing which very rarely happens. And when to that we join their religion, the excellent government they lived under, the vices of which they were cured, particularly their chief

* Vol. II. p. 264.
† Vol. II. p. 261.

chief vice, drunkenneſs *, and the arts of life which they had learned from their governors, I think we may pronounce with great aſſurance that they were as happy as any people that ever exiſted, while they continued under the government of the Jeſuits.

We are now to inquire how ſo wonderful a change was wrought upon thoſe barbarians: And this is an inquiry which belongs, as much or more than any other, to the hiſtory of man; for it is inquiring how man, from a ſtate more wild and ſavage than that of any brute, came to be a mild and gentle animal, and in a ſtate which fitted him for the acquiſition of arts and ſciences, by which only our nature, in this ſtate of our exiſtence, can be brought to any degree of perfection. And I ſay that it was firſt by religion, the great tamer and civiliſer of men, without which I hold that no nation ever was or ever can be civiliſed. The Jeſuits there, were, among thoſe Indians, what Orpheus was among the Greeks, of whom Horace ſays,

> Sylveſtres homines ſacer interpreſque Deorum
> Cædibus et victu fœdo deterruit Orpheus †.

where by the words *cædibus et victu fœdo*, it is evident Horace meant that the Greeks then killed and ate their fellow creatures, as the Indians of South America did before they were tamed and humaniſed by their Miſſionaries, and as the Indians of North America, I believe, at once did, and ſome, far to the weſt and beyond the Apulachian mountains, do at this day ‡. And, 2*dly*, By muſic, for which men have a natural and inſtinctive love, and organs which eaſily adapt themſelves to the performance of it. And particularly this was the caſe

* Vol. I. p. 256.

† De Arte Poetica, v. 391.

‡ Origin and Progreſs of Language, vol. I. p. 227. in the note.

caſe of the Indians of the miſſions. Charlevoix tells us, that when the Jeſuits were ſailing upon the rivers, and for their own entertainment ſinging ſacred hymns, numbers of Indians flocked to hear them; and the Jeſuits, by explaining to them the ſubject of thoſe hymns, made converts of many of them †. Nor do I believe that any thing contributed more to the advancement of religion in their miſſions, than the choirs which, Charlevoix ſays, they had in all their churches ‡. And here the Miſſionaries may be ſaid to have acted among the Indians the part which Amphion acted among the Greeks, as Horace tells us,

> Dictus et Amphion, Thebanæ conditor arcis,
> Saxa movere ſono teſtudinis, et prece blanda
> Ducere quo vellet————

where the unciviliſed Greeks, at that time as dull and ſtupid as the Jeſuits found the Indians when they came among them §, are not unfitly imaged by Stones. Thoſe Miſſionaries may likewiſe, in the allegorical and poetical ſtile, properly enough be ſaid to be *Prometheuſes*, who *made* men; for the Indians, before they were civiliſed by them, were wild beaſts, and the worſt of wild beaſts, who did not deſerve the name of men.

The laſt method, I ſhall mention, uſed to tame thoſe Savages, was to eſtabliſh a polity and regular form of government among them. For, as man is intended, by God and nature, to live in civil ſociety, which cannot be without government, it is evident that, if he be not governed, he is an imperfect animal who cannot anſwer the purpoſe for which he is in this world. The Indians therefore of the miſſions were formed into regular governments, had property

† Vol. I. p 241.—242.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid. p. 240.

property aſſigned to them, without which no ſtate or community can ſubſiſt, and were taught arts by which that property was to be made uſeful.

From what I have ſaid of the Indians in their wild ſtate, and the methods that were uſed to civiliſe them, the following obſervations naturally ariſe.

In the *firſt* place, it may be obſerved, that though men may be aſſociated and live together, yet, if there be not government among them, not even the family government, ſo that *every man does what ſeemeth good in his own eyes*, (the deſcription which our ſcripture gives us of the worſt ſtate that I think men can be in), it is impoſſible, by the nature of things, but that in ſuch a ſociety there muſt be the greateſt diſorder. And when to that diſorder is added the intemperate uſe of ſtrong liquors, by which the diſorderly paſſions of ſuch men muſt be very much inflamed:—And when to all this is added the fleſh diet, carried to ſuch exceſs as to make men devour every thing of the animal life that comes within their reach, even their own ſpecies, the moſt unnatural of all food, and ſuch as no land animal except man uſes, the diſorders in ſuch a ſociety muſt go to ſuch an exceſs, as to make man a wild beaſt, and worſe than any other wild beaſt which does not feed upon his own ſpecies. In ſuch a ſociety there can be no ſenſe of the *Pulchrum* and *Honeſtum*, which is the foundation of all virtue among men, and of every generous and noble ſentiment. Of this, it is obſerved by Diodorus Siculus and other writers, that nations living in the brutal ſtate, though not in a ſtate ſo brutal as that of the wild Indians, are intirely void. And Polybius has very well obſerved, that this ſenſe comes to men only when government is eſtabliſhed among them: For, though it be as natural to man as intellect and ſcience, yet he has, in the firſt ſtages of his progreſſion, only the capacity of acquiring it as

well as intellect and ſcience; ſo that, like theſe, it lyes latent in him till it be produced by certain circumſtances and ſituations of life. It is from their moſt intemperate and unnatural fleſh diet, without any mixture of vegetables, as we uſe it, and joined with their drunkenneſs, that theſe barbarous Indians are more diſeaſed than any other barbarians we hear of: For even the common fleſh diet, though uſed with moderation and without ſtrong liquors, not being natural to man, produces diſeaſes, and ſhortens life, as is evident from the long lives of the Antedeluvian Patriarchs, who ate no fleſh, and I think is evident from our own experience of men, who, having loſt their health by intemperance, the fleſh diet and the uſe of ſtrong liquors, have recovered it by the vegetable diet and drinking water. Now, what will recover health when loſt, will much more preſerve it before it be loſt. With reſpect to the diſeaſes of theſe Indians, I will only further obſerve, that nothing endeared their Miſſionaries more to them, than their attendance upon them when they were dying, and their adminiſtering all the rites of their Church to give them comfort, and eaſe of mind, in their laſt moments.—And thus I think I have accounted for the ſavage diſpoſitions of the Indians before they were tamed by the Jeſuits, and for their want of health.

What I have ſaid here, of the brutality and miſery of thoſe Indians, may appear contradictory to the account I have given of the inhabitants of the Pelew Iſlands and the New Zealanders *: But it ſhould be conſidered, that the men of the Pelew Iſlands do not live by hunting, as thoſe Indians do, but upon the fruits of the earth, and what fiſh they can catch, eating no fleſh, except that of ſome birds which they may happen to kill, and having no uſe of ſtrong liquors; and they have a very regular and orderly government, as I have ſhown †. And, as to the New Zealanders, they have no four footed beaſts in their Iſland; therefore they are not hunters, and ſo do not live upon fleſh, but upon vegetables, particularly the roots

* Page 56.

† Ibid.

roots of the fern and what fiſh they can catch; and have no uſe at all of ſtrong liquors. And it appears that they have a regular government, and practice an art, of which there could be no uſe except in a regular and a free government, I mean the Rhetorical Art *. How different the character and manners of theſe two nations muſt be from thoſe of the wild Indians, is evident at firſt ſight. And the truth appears to be, that, as I have elſewhere obſerved †, man, while he is yet a mere animal with only the capacity of being a rational creature, is not a ſocial, and much leſs a political, animal; for, as Marcus Antoninus has very well obſerved in his Meditations, *he is Political becauſe he is Rational* ‡. We are not therefore to wonder that the Indians of Paraguay, living without arts or civility, and feeding only upon fleſh, and even the fleſh of their own ſpecies, and having their paſſions inflamed by the moſt intemperate uſe of ſtrong liquors, ſhould be ſo ſavage and wild a people as they are deſcribed by the Jeſuits.

I will now proceed to make ſome reflections upon the methods that were uſed to recover the Paraguaiſe from ſo barbarous a ſtate. The firſt method I mentioned was *Religion*, without which, as I have ſaid, no nation ever was civiliſed. For, the belief of a power ſuperior to man, I hold to be abſolutely neceſſary, when men have come to think at all, or to have any uſe of reaſon; nor do I believe, that there either is or ever was any aſſemblage of men, deſerving the name of a nation, that did not believe that there are powers that govern in this world, infinitely ſuperior to man. This no man, who thinks and obſerves what paſſes around him, can doubt of. Upon ſuch powers he will ſuppoſe that his happineſs or miſery muſt depend; and he will naturally believe them to be moved, as he himſelf is, by ſupplications and intreaties; and that they will

* Origin of Language, vol. VI. p. 4.

† Page 62. of this Volume.

‡ Εστι το λογικον, ζωϊς και πολιτικον. *Meditat.* Lib. 10.

favour thoſe who apply to them in that way, and who do what is agreeable to them, but on the contrary, will puniſh thoſe who neglect them, and act contrary to their will. Whatever, therefore, is recommended to them, as the command of thoſe ſuperior powers, will be readily obeyed. And, thus it appears, that religion is founded in the nature of man; and that it is impoſſible to conceive any number of men collected together, having the leaſt uſe of reaſon, though they do not employ it otherwiſe than in procuring the neceſſaries of life, without ſuppoſing that they have ſome idea of ſuperior powers, by whom they are to be aſſiſted or hindered in procuring thoſe neceſſaries of life. And, accordingly, in all the barbarous nations of which we have heard, there were men who pretended to have a communication with thoſe ſuperior powers, and to predict to their countrymen events which were to happen, and upon which their good and ill fortune depended. Such there were even among thoſe barbarous Indians, and who, therefore, were their inſtructors and directors in all their affairs. Among theſe men the Jeſuits introduced Chriſtianity. But it was not by teaching only, or reaſoning with them, that they made them Chriſtians. But they applied to their ſenſes, by which Savages are much more governed than by reaſon; and captivated them by a worſhip of pomp and ſhow, feſtivals and proceſſions *, with many ceremonies, which may appear to many to be mere ſuperſtition, but with which the Catholic Religion, as is well known, abounds.

One

* 'The proceſſion of the Holy Sacrament paſſes under a triumphal arch, compoſed 'of branches of trees adorned with flowers, and with birds of different kinds and colours attached to the branches by very long ſtrings, ſo that they ſeem to be altogether 'at their liberty; and by their notes, mixed with the muſic of the proceſſion, make a 'moſt agreeable melody.' This, ſays Charlevoix, (vol. I. p. 258. and 269.) is a beauty of ſimple nature; and, for my part, the ſight of ſuch an arch ſo adorned, would have pleaſed me more than any arch which architecture could erect; and the muſic of ſuch a proceſſion I likewiſe believe would have pleaſed me more than any concert I ever heard.

One of the greateſt allurements of theſe Savages, and which made multitudes of them follow the Miſſionaries, was, as I have obſerved, muſic, and muſic ſuch as the Church muſic among the Roman Catholics is, tending to inſpire devout and religious ſentiments. How great the power of muſic is, and how congenial to the nature of man, is well known to the philoſopher, and indeed is a matter of common obſervation and experience. By muſic, the manners may be formed of young men, even of children, who are incapable of being inſtructed by teaching or reaſoning; and, accordingly, it was very much employed by antient wiſdom in the education of youth. And if it had not been employed in taming theſe Savage Indians, and ſubduing their violent paſſions, inflamed, as I have ſaid, by their moſt unnatural diet and manner of life, I do not believe that they ever could have made Chriſtians or even Men of them.

The laſt method uſed by the Miſſionaries for humaniſing thoſe brutal Savages, was to eſtabliſh a good government among them. If it had been a popular government, it would have done them no good; but, on the contrary, would have been productive of much diſorder. But it was a religious government; for the Miſſionaries were their governors: And it was adminiſtred by officers of their nomination; and it may be obſerved, that the firſt governments in all countries were more or leſs connected with the religion of the country. The government of Egypt, the moſt antient, and, I think, the beſt government we read of, was a government by Prieſts; and the Jewiſh government was much of the ſame kind. The firſt government of the Greeks was by their Heroic Kings, that is, Kings who were ſuppoſed to be deſcended of their Gods.

And here I conclude what I have to ſay of this remarkable event in Paraguay, which may be ſaid to be a renewal of antient times, and to have verified, by recent facts, the truth of what we are told,

under

under the diſguiſe of fable, of Orpheus and Amphion having civiliſed the Greeks by religion and muſic; but which, I believe, to be as much a truth as the Jeſuits having civiliſed, in that way, the people of Paraguay: And I would have our philoſophers conſider, whether religion be not as neceſſary for continuing good government among men, as for introducing it at firſt; or, whether our Scotch philoſopher, Mr David Hume, be in the right, who has informed us, that the leſs religion there is in a nation ſo much the better.

The order of the Jeſuits, who wrought thoſe wonders in Paraguay, is now no more. I was in France when the perſecution of them began there; and I had an opportunity of being pretty well informed how it was brought about: But to ſpeak of this is foreign to our preſent purpoſe: I will only ſay, what is very well known, and is acknowledged even by their enemies, that they were the moſt learned body of men in Europe; nor do I think, that there has been, at any time in Europe, ſince the Colleges of Philoſophers which were inſtituted by Pythagoras in *Magna Graecia*, a more ſelect body of men: And I hold the diſperſion of the Jeſuits to be one of the greateſt blows that learning and philoſophy have got, ſince the diſperſion of thoſe Colleges. The Jeſuits, before they could be admitted into the order, went through a novitiate of no leſs than fifteen years, which time they ſpent not only in ſtudying moſt diligently Antient Learning, Antient Philoſophy, and Chriſtian Theology, but alſo in teaching them: For teaching, as well as learning, was part of their education; and, indeed, there is nothing that perfects our knowledge more, in any thing we have learned, than teaching it to others; and it will even make us learned in ſome degree, when we were ignorant before, according to the common proverbial ſaying,

> Qui docet indoctos, licet indoctiſſimus eſſet,
> Ipſe brevi reliquis doctior eſſe queat.

And

And after they were admitted into the order, as all men are not by nature fit for all things, for,

Non omnia poſſumus omnes,

the ſuperior of the order took care to be well informed of the natural bent of the genius of thoſe who entered into the order, and employed them according to their different talents. Some, whoſe genius ſeemed to be only for letters, were made Profeſſors in Univerſities, and employed in writing books of learning. Others, who were of a more active ſpirit, and more fitted for the buſineſs of life, were ſent to Courts, and employed as the Confeſſors of Kings; and very often by their councils the kingdom was governed: While others of a more daring ſpirit, and who ſhowed an enthuſiaſtic zeal for the propagation of the Goſpel among barbarous nations, and had fortitude enough to ſubmit, with reſignation, even to martyrdom in that cauſe, were ſent to North or South America, to the Eaſt Indies, or to China; and, I believe, they have done and ſuffered more for the propagation of the Goſpel, than all the men of modern times put together: So that they may ſay,

Quae regio in terris noſtri non plena laboris.

What is become of their Miſſions, ſince they left them, I am very curious to know, but have not been able to learn. I have only been told, what I can very well believe, that the parting was moſt ſorrowful, of them and their dear Neophytes; and that many tears were ſhed upon both ſides. If they had not choſen to leave them, I am confident that the Spainards had no power in South America, that could have forced them: And they might have gone on increaſing the number of their little ſtates, and have formed a confederacy among them, not unworthy to be compared to the Achaean league in Greece, which might have been a match for any force that the Spainards could have brought from Old Spain: And I doubt not but that, in proceſs of time, they might have made Jeſuits of their diſciples; and ſo eſtabliſhed a new world of learning, on the other ſide of the Atlantic.

BOOK II.

Of the Invention of Arts and Sciences.

CHAP. I.

The ſubject of this book is the invention of Arts and Sciences, beginning with the Art of Language.—Language not natural to Man, but an Art.—Men herded, and carried on ſome common buſineſs before they Spoke.—Language began with animal cries, varied perhaps by ſome articulation, in imitation of certain Birds;—varied alſo by Muſical Tones.—By ſuch a Language no progreſs could have been made in Arts and Sciences.—The Chineſe Language not fit for Arts or Sciences:—Theſe, therefore, among them all, put into hieroglyphical writing even their law buſineſs.—A Language of Art neceſſary for the invention of Arts and Sciences.—This the moſt difficult of all Arts.—Proof of this:—Firſt *as to articulation.—This performed by the organs of the mouth operating variouſly.—The firſt organ of ſpeech that appears to have been chiefly uſed, is the throat.—By this guttural ſounds are produced, ſuch as the Orang Outang uſes, the Wild Girl that was ſeen in France, and the Huron in North America.—Articulate ſounds divided into vowels and conſonants.—The nature of theſe explained.—The vowels few in number, the conſonants many.—The conſonants much*

more

more difficult in pronunciation than the vowels.—Differences from thence accounted for, betwixt the barbarous and civilized Languages.—Another difference betwixt the barbarous and civilized Languages, is the extraordinary length of the words of the barbarous Languages:—This accounted for.—Of the origin of articulation.—It could not have been brought to any perfection, but in a country where it was ſtudied and practiſed as an Art.—Of the progreſs of articulation from monoſyllabical words to words of ſeveral ſyllables.—Of the variety in the ſound of Language by diphthongs;—and by vowels and conſonants, aſpirated and not aſpirated.—Language muſt have been analiſed into its elemental ſounds, before the ſound of it could be made ſo perfect.—Of the melody and rhythm of Language.—Of the expreſſion of ideas by Language.—Theſe of number infinite;—but divided into certain claſſes or parts of ſpeech.—This diviſion correſpondent to the diviſion of our ideas into Categories.—The number of words appear to be infinite;—made camprehenſible in our memories, by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.—Of Syntax, and the neceſſity of it.—Concluſion, that Language is the greateſt of all Arts.—Objection anſwered, That children learn to ſpeak without Art.—Speech, though a moſt common thing, is very wonderful:—An account given how it is learned;—of ſo difficult invention, that it would have been a miracle, if Peter the Wild Boy had ſpoken when he was firſt caught, or if the Orang Outang could ſpeak.—Objection anſwered, to the Orang Outang's being a Man, That he is the only Man, that has been found, who could not ſpeak.—General obſervations upon the invention of Language.

IN this book I propoſe to treat of the invention of Arts and Sciences, a principal part of the Hiſtory of Man, the ſubject of this part of my work. I will begin with the invention of Language, the parent art, as I have ſaid, of all arts and ſciences *, and with-

* Page 70. of this volume.

out which we muſt have ſtill continued an animal, only capable of intellect and ſcience.

That language is not natural to man, but an invention of art, I think I have proved ſufficiently in what I have written upon the Origin of Language *: Or if the reader ſhould have any doubt in the matter, I hope it will be removed by what follows in this chapter, where I am to ſhow that it is not only an art, but the greateſt of all arts, and of the moſt difficult invention.

That men muſt have herded together, before they could have invented a language, or indeed any other art, is evident; for it is only by communication together, in one way or another, that men have made any diſcovery in any art or ſcience, a ſolitary Savage being incapable of inventing any thing of the leaſt value. That animals, even ſuch as are incapable of intellect and ſcience, when they herd together can communicate without language, and can even carry on ſome joint work, is alſo evident; for the beavers, who not only have not the uſe of ſpeech, but are incapable of acquiring it, can nevertheleſs carry on their buſineſs of building and repairing their dams by ſigns and geſtures and inarticulate cries †. And in the ſame way the Orang Outang carries on his buſineſs, building huts, arming himſelf with a ſtick, and attacking and defending himſelf againſt his enemies ‡. In this kind of ſocial intercourſe men continued, I am perſuaded, a very long time, before they invented a language; which certainly took its riſe from animal cries §, varied perhaps by ſome articulation which they may have learned by imitation of ſuch birds as the Cuckoo or Cockitoo, which they may have heard; and I am perſuaded that they alſo varied it by muſical tones, that is tones differing in gravity and acuteneſs; for though Man

* Vol. I.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 53.

‡ Page 27. and following of this volume.

§ Origin of Language, vol. I. Book III. Chap. IV.

Man has not from Nature the faculty of articulation like theſe birds that I have mentioned, yet ſhe has given him the power of varying his natural cries by tones of the muſical kind. By this I would not be underſtood to mean that man by nature ſings as ſome birds do; but that he has from nature ſuch tones of voice, of which muſic may be formed, and of which, according to Lucretius and the Wild Girl I ſaw in France, he made ſongs in imitation of the birds. I am, therefore, perſuaded, that the firſt languages were all more or leſs muſical, as the Greek, Latin, and Sanſcrit were; and as the Chineſe and the languages of North America are at this day *.

But a language with ſome articulation and even variety of tones, though it might be ſufficient to communicate men's appetites and deſires to one another, and to carry on ſome of the neceſſary arts of life, never could ſerve the purpoſe of expreſſing ideas and forming arts and ſciences. Even the Chineſe language, though it have a good deal of articulation, and a wonderful variety of tones, by which it is ſufficient for carrying on the common buſineſs of life, yet is altogether unfit for communicating matters of art and ſcience; and therefore that is done among the Chineſe, by their hieroglyphical writing, expreſſing not the words of their language, but their ideas. The language they ſpeak is in this reſpect ſo deficient, that it is not fit for carrying on their law ſuits; ſo that they have no pleadings, but all their judicial proceedings are in their hieroglyphical writing †. It was, therefore, of abſolute neceſſity that a

* Origin of Language, vol. V. p. 443. and vol. VI. p. 132.

† This fact I have taken from a book, in two volumes 12*mo*, entitled, 'Miſcellaneous Pieces relating to the Chineſe,' vol. I. p. 12. This is a book in which many curious particulars are related concerning both the written and the oral language of the Chineſe; and which, I think, well vouched by the authorities the author quotes. According to the account he gives of the language they ſpeak, it is the moſt defective, and the moſt incoherent language, that is now to be found in the world, more defective than any of the barbarous languages, which I have mentioned in the firſt volume of the Origin

language of much greater art than the Chineſe, or than any other barbarous language, ſhould have been invented, before any conſiderable progreſs could have been made in the invention of arts and ſciences, which could not be without a more perfect communication by ſpeech.

That a language of art is the greateſt as well as moſt uſeful art practiſed by men, and likewiſe of moſt difficult invention, I have ſhown in ſeveral paſſages of the Origin and Progreſs of Language *: In one of which †, I have obſerved a very great difference betwixt language and the other arts practiſed by man: That in theſe other arts, ſuch as, architecture, ſculpture, and painting, nature has furniſhed us the materials; whereas of language we have ourſelves furniſhed the materials, that is, articulate ſounds, which we may be ſaid to have created; and this alone makes it the moſt wonderful of the arts of men. But as the difficulty of the invention of this art is a matter, I think, of great curioſity, and not of common obſervation;—and as it will tend much to ſupport the argument, which I am to maintain, that Egypt is the parent country of this as well as of the other arts and of ſciences, I will here ſay a good deal more upon the ſubject.

As

Origin of Language. And it would be intirely unfit even for the ordinary commerce of life, if they did not ſupply the defect of their articulation, not by tones only, but by ſigns and geſtures, and ſomething like writing on the palms of their hands. (p. 33.). I once thought that the different ſignifications, which they give to the ſame monoſyllable, had ſome affinity, ſo as to reſemble in ſome ſort our derivative, compounded or inflected words. But this author has convinced me of the contrary by the example he has given of the monoſyllable *po*, which has eleven different ſignifications, according as it is differently accented. In one way accented, it denotes *glaſs*; in another way, it ſignifies *to boil*; in a third way, *to winnow corn or rice*; in a fourth way, *ſage* or *prudent* or *liberal*; in a fifth way, *to prepare*; and in a ſixth way, *an old woman*, &c. (p. 28.) So that the wonder is, not that ſuch a language ſhould need the aid of geſtures, but that, in any way, it ſhould be made intelligible. (ſee what I have further ſaid of this ſtrange language, vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 139. and following.).

* Vol. I. book III. and vol. II. book II.

† Vol. IV. p. 177. and following; and Vol. VI. p. 135. and following.

As articulation is eſſential to language, I will begin with conſidering the nature of it; and I truſt to make it appear, that this alone is ſo complicated and various an operation, that if there were nothing more in language, it muſt appear a work of the greateſt art, and altogether of art; for nature has done no more than to furniſh us with the organs of this ſo artificial operation. So that, articulate ſounds, the materials of language, are, as I have ſaid, intirely of our own production.—And here we may obſerve the difference betwixt muſic and language. Nature has not only given us an organ for muſic; but we have naturally in our voice the variation of *grave* and *acute*, which are the materials of which muſic is formed.

The organs of pronunciation are the throat, the larynx, the tongue, the palate, the teeth, and the lips; all of them, as I have obſerved, out of ſight, (except the two laſt mentioned,) and their operations very nice and delicate. As they are for the greater part concealed, their operations are not perceptible by our ſenſes; but if we ſaw them, as we ſee the operations of our hands, we ſhould, I am perſuaded, admire them very much. Theſe organs, which I have mentioned, conſtitute what Mr Gebelin, an author whom I ſhall frequently quote in the ſequel, calls our *vocal inſtrument*. He has very minutely and accurately deſcribed it in the 6th chapter of the third volume of his *Monde Primitif*. According to his deſcription of it, it is a very complicated machine: And if we can ſet it going, and work it by nature merely, without inſtruction or example, and without practice or obſervation, as ſome imagine, I think there is no machine that we may not work in the ſame manner, nor any thing of art that we may not perform by mere inſtinct. I will not repeat what M. Gebelin has ſaid at ſo great length in the chapter above quoted; it is ſufficient for my purpoſe to obſerve, that the breath, which comes from our lungs, and, paſſing through the windpipe, goes out at our mouths, is the material of which ſpeech is compoſed.

compoſed. It receives various modifications in its paſſage through that part of the windpipe which is called the larynx; and particularly from the upper part of the larynx, which is called in Engliſh *the knot of the throat*, and in French *la glotte*, by which the breath enters the mouth: And it receives ſtill more modifications in the mouth, by the organs the mouth contains, ſuch as the tongue, the palate, and the teeth, and by the lips, through which it goes into the open air. By a certain poſition of theſe organs of the mouth, while the breath is paſſing through it, are formed thoſe articulate ſounds, which we call *vowels*: And by the different actions of thoſe organs are formed ſounds of much greater variety, which are called *conſonants*, but which, as the name imports, cannot be ſounded by themſelves, but only in conjunction with the vowels. Our vocal inſtrument, therefore, is ſo complex, as M. Gebelin has deſcribed it, that it is not only a wind inſtrument ſuch as a flute, but alſo a ſtringed inſtrument, and likewiſe an inſtrument that operates by the touch like an organ *. But before the voice is ſo variouſly modified by the organs of the mouth, it receives a modification by different contractions and dilatations of that part of the larynx above mentioned, called the knot of the throat, by which are produced muſical tones, differing in acuteneſs and gravity; which tones, I am perſuaded, accompanied the pronunciation of all the antient languages. That this was the caſe of the Greek and Latin, is well known. The Sanſcrit alſo was and is ſtill a muſical language in India, as I have elſewhere obſerved †; and ſo was alſo the Hebrew: And as muſic is more natural to man than articulation, particularly in the ſouthern and eaſtern countries, ſo that I am perſuaded he ſung before he ſpoke, I think it could not well be otherwiſe. *Laſtly*, there is another modification of the voice before it comes into the mouth; and that is in the throat, by which it forms guttural ſounds.

The

* Vol III. of *Monde Primitif*, p. 74.

† Vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 149.

The ſubject, upon which all theſe various operation are performed, is, as I have obſerved, the breath from the lungs, which paſſes through the throat into the mouth, and from thence into the open air; and in that paſſage it receives all thoſe various modifications, which form articulation. The firſt of theſe is from the throat, and the leaſt artificial of any of them. It appears, therefore, to have been firſt uſed, and more uſed than any other, when men firſt began to ſpeak. The Orang Outang, who has not yet learned the art, utters, as I have ſaid*, guttural ſounds; and the Wild Girl I ſaw in France, who had learned to ſpeak, told me, that the language of her countrymen was full of guttural ſounds, and that they ſpoke every thing with open mouth. The Hurons of North America do the ſame†; and Baron Hontan tells us, that he ſpent four days to no purpoſe, in trying to teach a Huron to pronounce the labial conſonants, ſuch as B, P, M ‡; and the reaſon is, that ſpeech was originally formed from animal cries, as I have elſewhere ſhown §, which are all with open mouth without any uſe of the lips.

Articulate ſounds are divided, as I have ſaid, into vowels and conſonants. For the pronunciation of vowels nothing more is required than a certain poſition of the organs of the mouth, through which the breath paſſes. They are, therefore, few in number; nor do I know that any language in the world has more than five of them, though, by compounding them, they make, in the languages of art, ſeveral more vocal ſounds, called diphthongs. The conſonants are formed by different actions of the ſeveral organs of pronunciation, which may be ſaid *to articulate* in the proper ſenſe of the word, that is, to break and divide the ſound of the vowels, which otherwiſe would be continuous. They are, therefore, much more numerous than the vowels, and of pronunciation very much more difficult; though they cannot

* Page 28.

† Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 478. and following.

‡ Ibid. p. 502.

§ Ibid. Book III. Chap. IV.

cannot be ſounded without the vowels, that is, without the breath paſſing through the mouth.

From what I have ſaid of the nature of vowels and conſonants, ſeveral particulars concerning the barbarous languages may be explained: And, *1mo*, as the vowels are abſolutely neceſſary for the pronunciation of language, and at the ſame time are ſo much more eaſily pronounced than the conſonants, it is very natural that the barbarous languages, for the greater part, ſhould have the uſe of all the five. All of them, however, have not the whole *five*. The Chineſe has not the U, but in place of it uſes the diphthong EU. And the ſame is the caſe of even the Engliſh language; which like the Chineſe uſes the diphthong in place of the ſimple vowel. But that this is not the ſound of the Greek *ypſilon*, is evident from what the Halicarnaſſian has told us, in his treatiſe *of compoſition*, of the pronunciation of that vowel, and which is preſerved in the French language. This alone may ſhow us the difficulty even of the pronunciation of language; when a language, which I reckon one of the beſt that is now ſpoken in Europe, has not the uſe of one of no more than *five* of the moſt ſimple ſounds of language. But that the barbarous languages ſhould be very deficient in the conſonants, is eaſily accounted for from the difficulty of their pronunciation: And accordingly, the Chineſe language wants the conſonants, B, D, R, X, and Z*: The Huron language, in North America, wants the conſonants B, P, M, as I have before obſerved †, alſo the conſonants F, V, G, N, and even the vowel U, which the Hurons cannot pronounce for the reaſons I have given in the paſſage quoted below ‡. And the Peruvian language wants no leſs than ſix conſonants, S, B, D, F, G, and

* See the Miſcellaneous Pieces, relating to the Chineſe above quoted, Vol. I. p. 24.

† Page 111.

‡ Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edition p. 479.—480.

and X *. 2*do*, This makes the ſound of thoſe languages very vocal, conſiſting of many ſyllables of only one vowel. 3*tio*, When they uſe conſonants, they ſeldom uſe more than one of them in the ſame ſyllable; ſo that when two conſonants happen to ſtand together in the ſame word, they divide them in the pronunciation into different ſyllables. Thus in the Peruvian language, they pronounce *Roc-ro* not *Ro cro* †. For to uſe more, would be to join together different actions of ſeveral organs of ſpeech, which make a difficult pronunciation, and indeed impoſſible to ſavages who are not accuſtomed to it: Whereas, in languages of more art, four or more conſonants are ſounded together in the ſame ſyllable, as in the Greek words, σφυγξ and φλοξ, and the Engliſh word, *ſtrength*; where the action of the different organs is ſo complicated, (more complicated than any action of our hands, or any other member of our body,) that, I am perſuaded, no ſavage, unleſs he was taught when young, could ever learn to pronounce theſe words. In order to give a variety to their language, which they want by having ſo few conſonants, and by not making ſo much uſe of thoſe they have as they might do, they often repeat in the ſame word the ſame ſyllable, conſiſting only of one vowel, as in the name of a Lady of Ottaheite, *Othea-Othea:* And indeed, in a language ſo vocal as theirs, they could hardly, without ſuch a repetition, diſtinguiſh the ſeveral words from one another.

There is another peculiarity of the barbarous languages, I mean the extraordinary length of their words, but which is derived from another ſource, namely, that language was originally formed out of animal cries ‡, which have all a conſiderable length; ſo that the language

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edition, p. 505.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. Book III. Chap. IV.

of barbarians is nothing but thoſe cries, joined with ſome articulation*. But even with their articulation and their words of great length, very different in that reſpect from the Chineſe words, they could not expreſs their meaning fully without ſigns and geſtures, ſuch as our dumb men uſe. So that their language may be ſaid to be little better than the language of dumb men, aided by ſome articulation. And the ſame may be ſaid of the language of the Chineſe, who, as I have obſerved, uſe a great many ſigns and geſtures to help out their very imperfect articulation, more imperfect I believe than that of any of the barbarous nations.

But, it will be aſked, how did thoſe nations get their articulation, imperfect as it is? That they may have learned to articulate ſome few ſounds from ſuch birds as the Cuckoo or Cockitoo, if they happen to be in their country, is, as I have ſaid, poſſible. But even theſe few ſounds they could not learn to articulate perfectly, as they could hear theſe birds but ſeldom, and only at certain ſeaſons of the year: For though our children learn to articulate ſounds very much more various and more difficult, by mere imitation, it is by hearing them continually for years together, without any interval, except when they are ſleeping. There muſt, therefore, have been ſome country where the diſcovery was made, how much the expreſſion of the human voice might be enlarged by articulation, and where it was ſtudied as an art of the greateſt uſe; nor do I think, that articulation, ſuch as is fit for a language of art, of which only I am now ſpeaking, could otherwiſe have been invented.

In

* Who would know more of the ſound of barbarous languages, may conſult vol. I. Origin of Language; and the paſſages from that vol. quoted in vol. II. p. 6. 7. 8. As to the length of their words, there is one mentioned by Mr de la Condumine, uſed by a people that he fell in with upon his voyage down the river Amazons, of no leſs than eight ſyllables, denoting the number three, the word is, Solazzarorincouricie.

In this invention there muſt have been a progreſs, as in the invention of other arts; and I think men muſt have begun with articulating one ſound, and of that making one word, before they joined together ſeveral articulate ſounds to compoſe but one word. In ſhort, I believe, that the firſt languages were all monoſyllabical, as the Chineſe is at this day. But even this firſt ſtep in the art of language the Chineſe did not make, but got it from Egypt, as I have ſaid elſewhere *, and, I hope, ſhall prove to the readers ſatisfaction. But it did not remain, I am perſuaded, ſo long there in that infantine ſtate as it has done in China *; but the monoſyllables were lengthend into words of ſeveral ſyllables. The monoſyllables, however, were not for that laid aſide, but mixed with words of ſeveral ſyllables, which made a beautiful variety in the ſound of the language; for without variety there can be no beauty in any art. And beſides this variety in a perfect language, there is the variety, above-mentioned, of diphthongs, or vowels run together in the pronunciation, and of vowels aſpirated and not aſpirated, and of conſonants likewiſe aſpirated and not aſpirated, and ſuch as are in the middle betwixt theſe two †.

It may be thought, that what I have ſaid here, of the firſt languages conſiſting of monoſyllabical words, is contradicted by what I have obſerved of the great length of words in the barbarous languages. But theſe languages are without art; and even, artleſs as they are, they could not have been invented by a barbarous people. What, therefore, they have of articulation, the barbarians muſt have

* See what I have ſaid further of the Chineſe Language, vol. VI. Origin of Language, p. 139. and following.

† See what I have ſaid of the different kinds of letters, vol. II. of Origin of Language, book II. chap. II.

got from a people who had the uſe of language, with whom they happened to have ſome communication. From them they would learn to articulate ſome words; and by imitation they would be naturally led to invent other articulate ſounds: For I do not think, as I have ſaid, that from hearing only ſuch birds as the Cuckoo and Cockitoo, ſuppoſing them to be in their country, and continuing long enough in it to enable them to imitate their voices, the moſt barbarous languages ever could have been formed. Now, thoſe articulate ſounds, which they had learned from nations that had an art of language, they would very naturally lengthen, ſo as to make them reſemble the animal cries, which they uſed before they got articulate ſounds, and which have a certain length. But when language was formed into an art, which could not have been among thoſe barbarians, and when it was intirely removed from animal cries, and made to conſiſt only of articulate ſounds put together in a certain order, it was natural, and, indeed, I think, neceſſary, that men ſhould begin with the moſt ſimple words, that is, words of one ſyllable, before they proceeded to compound thoſe monoſyllables into words of many ſyllables. This, as I have ſaid, in the paſſage above quoted *, actually happened in Egypt, where the firſt language of art was invented, as I ſhall afterwards ſhow. And it was very natural that it ſhould be ſo in the firſt ſtep in the progreſs towards a language of art; for, if the firſt words of ſuch a language had been words of ſeveral ſyllables, the three great arts of language, *derivation*, *compoſition*, and *flection*, could not have been practiced without making the words of great length, as great as the words of the barbarous languages. This monoſyllabical language came from Egypt to China, where it is the language at this day; and with it came alſo the written language, or Hieroglyphical characters, which have ſuch a connection with characters of that kind

* Vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 139. &c.

kind to be ſeen at this day in Egypt, that they muſt have come from the ſame country *.

All the beauty and variety of the ſound of language, which I have mentioned, could not have been diſcovered, if language had not been firſt analyſed into its elemental ſounds. This I believe was done before theſe elemental ſounds got a form, which made them viſible to the eye; that is to ſay, before alphabetical characters and writing was invented; which compleated the art of language, by making it ſpeak, not only to thoſe who are preſent but to the abſent, and even to future generations †.

But, beſides all the variety I have mentioned, there is ſtill ſomething wanting to make a language of perfect art; and that is melody and rhythm, which make the muſic of language, and, I believe, where they were governed by art, as they were among the Greeks, added more to the pleaſure of the ear than all the things I have mentioned ‡. Of theſe I have treated very fully elſewhere §; and I will only add here, that as in animal cries there is a variety of ſounds, differing in tones as well as in length, it was very natural that there ſhould be the ſame variety in language, which ſucceeded to thoſe cries, and may be ſaid to have been formed out of them by being articulated; and, accordingly, the moſt antient languages have all, as I have obſerved, that variety.—And thus I have finiſhed what I have to ſay of the *ſound*, or *material part*, as I call it, of language; which I have analyſed into Articulation, Melody, and Rhythm.

But

* Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 438.

† See more of this ſubject in vol. II. of Origin of Language, book II. chap. II.

‡ See what I have ſaid upon this ſubject, vol. VI. Origin of Language, book II. chap. IV. and vol. II.

§ Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 226. and 227.

But the ſound of language, however muſical it may be, and pleaſant to the ear, is only ſubſervient to the purpoſe for which language was intended; and that is the expreſſion of our ideas, and the communication of them to one another. A language of art, and which is proper for the invention and cultivation of other arts and of ſciences, muſt expreſs all the things in the heavens or the earth, of which we have any notion or conception. We muſt give names to accidents as well as to ſubſtances, alſo to the ſeveral relations of things to one another; and we muſt expreſs what they *act* and what they *ſuffer*. Theſe things are of number infinite. But ſcience here ſets bounds to infinity, as we have ſhown it does in the matter of our ideas of genuſes and ſpecieſes. This is done by the diviſion of words into what is called the Parts of Speech, which may be called the Categories of Language;—comprehending, like the categories, the whole of things, but divided and arranged in ſuch a way as to ſerve the purpoſe of ſpeech; and not conſidering the nature of things abſtractly, as they are conſidered in the categories, but with reference only to their uſe in language. They admit, however, of that general diviſion of the categories into *ſubſtance* and *accidents*; and accordingly Plato and Ariſtotle have divided the parts of ſpeech into theſe two, calling the one of them expreſſing Subſtances *a noun*, and the other expreſſing Accidents *a verb* *.

Words, however, though they admit of this diviſion into claſſes, appear ſtill to be infinite in number, as well as the ideas which they expreſs. They would ſeem, therefore, to be altogether incomprehenſible by our memories, and conſequently not fit for the uſe of language; and they certainly would be ſo, if all things were to be expreſſed by words having no connection with one another. But ſcience has contrived three ways of connecting words together both by ſound and ſenſe, ſo that the knowledge of one word naturally leads

* See vol. II. of the Origin of Language, p 28.

leads to the knowledge of other words. And theſe are the three great arts of language, known by the names of *derivation*, *compoſition*, *and flection* *. Of theſe three arts I reckon *flection* the greateſt; for in nouns it expreſſes numbers and genders, and by its Caſes the ſeveral relations which the thing expreſſed by the noun has to other things; and in the verb it not only expreſſes *numbers*, but *perſons*, *times*, and, beſides theſe, *the diſpoſitions of the human mind with reſpect to the action of the verb* †: And all this is expreſſed by a variation only, and ſometimes a very ſmall variation of the word. But of all theſe three great arts of language I have ſaid ſo much in the 2d volume of the Origin of Language, and likewiſe in the 4th (book I. chap. II.) that I need ſay nothing of them here, except to obſerve, that the barbarous languages, as they do not uſe theſe arts, are extremely defective in ſenſe as well as in ſound; and are obliged to expreſs things, neceſſarily connected together, by ſounds quite different; and not having learned to divide their language into parts of ſpeech, they very often expreſs two or three different things, ſuch as the action, the agent, and the ſubject of the action, by the ſame word. All theſe defects of barbarous languages I have obſerved in the firſt volume of the Origin of Language.

Although we may have given names to all the things of which we

* See the nature of theſe explained in vol. II. Origin of Language, p. 12. and following.

† The variety of the flections of a Greek verb is really wonderful. I have counted 1300 words of different ſignifications, from one theme of a Greek verb, ſuch as τυπτω, including all the tenſes of the three voices, with the variations of theſe tenſes by perſons and numbers, and including alſo all the participles with their ſeveral genders, caſes, and numbers, but without taking in the derivatives or compounds of the verb. This may appear incredible to a man who has not ſtudied language as a ſcience, nor has not learned to diſtinguiſh betwixt a language of art, ſuch as the Greek, and the languages of barbarous nations. It is therefore not to be wondered, that Julius Cæſar, who was ſo ſtudious of language, ſhould even, amid his great occupations, have written a book *De Analogia*, the name the Latins gave to what we call *flection*.—Of Cæſar's ſtudy and knowledge of language, ſee what I have ſaid in vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 224. 225.; and vol. VI. p. 314.

we have any perception or idea, and although, by the three arts above-mentioned, we may have connected together a prodigious number of words, ſo as to make them comprehenſible in the memory, and applicable to uſe; yet ſtill there is ſomething wanting to complete the art of language;—a thing of ſuch conſequence, that without it all the other things I have mentioned would be of no uſe for the purpoſe of ſpeech. And this ſo neceſſary thing is what is called *Syntax*, by which the words are ſo connected together, and their relation to one another ſo marked, as to make *ſpeech* or *diſcourſe*; for if they were not ſo connected, though we might underſtand the ſenſe of every word the ſpeaker uſes, we could not make out his meaning. This art, therefore, is, as I have ſaid, the completion of the grammatical art; and it is performed in the learned languages chiefly by one of the three arts above-mentioned, namely, *flection*, but in the modern languages of Europe, chiefly by juxta-poſition. But of ſyntax I will ſay no more here, as I have treated of it at great length in the Origin of Language, vol. II. book III. chap. I.

In this manner, I hope, I have convinced the reader, that language is not only an art, but the greateſt as well the moſt uſeful art among men, and of moſt difficult invention, being a wonderful compoſition of what may be called the mechanical uſe of our organs of ſpeech, by which articulation is formed;—of muſical ſounds, by which the pronunciation of language is ſo much adorned;—and, laſtly, of ſcience, by which it is reduced to rule and made a perfect art.

What makes many people believe that language is natural to us, is, that we learn it when we are children, and can ſpeak it, when we are grown up, fluently and correctly, if we have been educated among people that ſpeak it ſo, without knowing any thing of the art of it. But it is by imitation, not by teaching, that we learn to ſpeak, as well as to do many other things; for man, as Ariſtotle has

has told us, is the moſt imitative of all animals: To which I will add, that he is particularly ſo by the voice; and in this reſpect he is more imitative than the monkey, who imitates only by geſtures, but not by the voice. We ought alſo to conſider, that when we are children we learn more eaſily by imitation, than at any other time of our lives; and, indeed, we can then learn in no other way; and, therefore, if we have not learned to ſpeak when we are young, we cannot learn afterwards without the greateſt difficulty. For proof of this, Peter the Wild Boy, being about fifteen years of age, as was conjectured, when he was caught in the woods of Hanover walking on all four, could only learn to articulate a few words, though he was put to ſchool, and no doubt much pains beſtowed to teach him, and though, as he heard as well as other men, he might by imitation have learned to ſpeak. When ſuch was the caſe of the Wild Boy, what muſt be the caſe of dumb men, who cannot learn to ſpeak by imitation at any time of their lives, but only by teaching. In this way, indeed, they learn to a certain degree, but with the utmoſt difficulty, though they be men of good underſtanding, and very deſirous to learn ſo uſeful an art. If any of my readers had ſeen, as I ſaw, the Abbé de l'Epee in France and Mr Braidwood in Scotland teach their dumb ſcholars to ſpeak, he would have needed no argument to convince him, that articulation was a moſt artificial thing. It was taught by theſe maſters with the greateſt pains and attention; for they not only ſhowed their ſcholars, by their own example, how they were to employ their organs in pronunciation, but they applied their hands to the mouths and jaws of their ſcholars, giving their organs the poſition and action which was proper.

I will only add further upon this ſubject, that ſpeaking, though it be one of the moſt common things among men, is perhaps the moſt wonderful thing to be found in our ſpecies. For that a man,

who has never learned the grammatical art, nor perhaps any art, and even a boy ſo young as to be incapable of being taught any art or ſcience, ſhould, by imitation merely and habit, practiſe a thing of ſo great art as language, and practiſe it well too, if he has been educated among people who ſpeak well, is to a philoſopher a matter of very great wonder. Even that he ſhould learn in that way a language, ſuch as ours, is wonderful: But it is much more wonderful, that a boy in Athens ſhould be able to learn, in that way, a language ſo difficult as the Greek, of ſuch variety of flection, derivation, and compoſition, and with melody and rhythm too ſo difficult, that we can only learn to underſtand it with a great deal of ſtudy, but not to ſpeak it *. It can only, I think, be accounted for, by ſuppoſing that our organs of pronunciation have an inſtinctive movement, ſuch as there are many in our animal economy, by which, upon hearing any articulate ſounds uttered, they put themſelves in a poſition, and make the motions, neceſſary for imitating theſe ſounds;—very imperfectly, no doubt, at firſt, but more perfectly by continual practice for a conſiderable time. But for this purpoſe the organs muſt be ſoft and pliable, ſuch as they are when we are young. But when we are advanced in years, and the organs become rigid and ſtiff, they cannot without the greateſt difficulty be made to accommodate themſelves to the various poſitions and motions which articulation requires. It was for this reaſon that Peter the Wild Boy could learn only to articulate a very few words. For the ſame reaſon, Baron Honton, as I have ſaid, could not teach a Huron to pronounce the labial conſonants, ſuch as B, P, and M †, which are among the firſt that out children learn to pronounce: And for this reaſon, likewiſe, a Frenchman, when he is advanced in years, cannot learn to articulate our aſpirated T, in ſuch words as *thee*, *though*, *thing*, &c.

Thus

* See upon this ſubject, vol. III. p. 220.

† Page 111. of this vol.; and vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 502.

Thus I think it is evident, that men, who have the ſenſe of hearing, learn to ſpeak by imitation, and not imitation only, but much practice; for that is abſolutely neceſſary to give us the ready uſe of ſo complicated an engine as our vocal inſtrument. But before any art can be learned, it muſt be invented; and if the practice of it be ſo difficult to be learned after it is invented, the invention of it muſt be much more difficult. It is, therefore, not to be wondered that Peter the Wild Boy could not ſpeak when he was caught, or that the Orang Outang does not ſpeak. But the wonder would have been, and indeed I ſhould have thought it a miracle, if either Peter had ſpoken when he was firſt catched, or if the Orang Outangs had the uſe of language in the ſtate in which they live; which is only in herds, not in a ſociety ſo formed and regulated as could produce the invention of ſo difficult an art as language.

I have heard it ſaid, that if the Orang Outang be a man, he is the only man that has as yet been found, who has not the uſe of ſpeech. If that were true, the argument would not be concluſive; for it would only prove that he is the only man that hitherto has been found in the natural ſtate. But the fact is not true; for Diodorus Siculus informs us *, that there was a Savage people that inhabited a country near the Red Sea, who lived in herds, copulated promiſcuouſly, and had not the uſe of ſpeech. And what muſt have made this people much taken notice of is another particular that he relates concerning them, and, I think, a more extraordinary thing ſtill; namely, that they lived without the uſe of water, for which he accounts from their food being raw fiſh. In that way ſome barbarous people have been known to live at ſea for many days without freſh water. And a gentleman whom I know, of the name of Graham, ſubſiſted for ſome months in a

* Lib. 3. cap. 18.

country upon the ſide of Hudſon's bay, without wood or water, and, conſequently, without the uſe of fire, upon game which the Indians he had with him killed for him, and which he ate raw*. There is, therefore, no reaſon to doubt what Diodorus has told us, of theſe wild men not having the uſe of ſpeech: And in a paſſage in the beginning of his hiſtory, which I have quoted elſewhere, he ſays of all men in general, that, while they were in the ſtate of nature, before arts and civility were introduced among them, they had not the uſe of ſpeech †.

I will conclude what I have ſaid, at ſo great length, of language, with ſome general obſervations upon the ſubject. In the *firſt* place, I think I have ſaid enough, and the reader may perhaps think more than enough, to convince every man, that language is not from nature, but a work of art, and of very great art. The uſe of our hands, that great inſtrument of the neceſſary arts of life, I have ſhown not to be from nature ‡, but one of the firſt ſteps that man made in his progreſs towards the arts of civil life. And if ſo, how can we ſuppoſe that the uſe of organs, hidden as thoſe of articulation are, and of more various and artificial uſe than any other of our organs, ſhould be from nature and not from art.

If there were any doubt in the matter, we muſt be convinced by the progreſs we ſee made in this art, as well as in others, by the barbarous nations;—from the Troglodytes mentioned by Herodotus, who, when they ſpoke, made a noiſe like bats;—from the ſavages whom M. de la Condamine ſaw upon the banks of the river Amazons, who make a muttering noiſe when they ſpeak;—from the Hottentots, and the people lately diſcovered to the weſt of New Mexico,

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 32. in the note.

† Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 372. 2d edition, where I have given the words of Diodorus.

‡ Page 35. and 36. of this vol.

Mexico, who ſupply their want of articulation by ſmacks*;—and from a people in South America, whom I have not hitherto mentioned, called Chiquites †, who ſpeak ſuch a jargon, that the Miſſionaries could not learn it, nor did they well underſtand one another;—When, I ſay, we obſerve the progreſs of language from thoſe ſavages to others more advanced in the art, ſuch as thoſe I have mentioned in chap. X. book III. of vol. I. of Origin of Language; and, when from them we proceed up to ſuch languages as the Greek or Sanſcrit, we cannot doubt that language is an art in which there has been the ſame progreſs as in other arts.

2*do*, That *writing*, or the making ſounds viſible, is a great art, no body can doubt; and alſo a very uſeful art, as it connects the oral language with the written in ſuch a manner, that, if we know the one, we alſo muſt know the other: Whereas in China the two languages are perfectly different; ſo that ſome nations in the neighbourhood uſe the written characters, or hieroglyphics as they are called, of the Chineſe, though they know nothing of the Chineſe oral language. But it was a greater art, and of much more difficult invention, as it muſt have been invented before the other, to make ideas *audible*, that is, to make the operations of our intellect perceptible by the ſenſe of hearing, which is done by language. It is this that makes the difference betwixt language and animal cries, which expreſs our ſenſations, appetites, and deſires, but can communicate no ideas: And thus by art we ſupply what is wanting in our natural faculties.

3*tio*, There is another thing which I have already mentioned, but which I will mention again, as I think it more wonderful in the art of language than any thing I have hitherto mentioned. And it is this, that by means of *derivation*, *compoſition*, and *flection*, by which

* See what I have ſaid of theſe barbarous languages, in vol. I. of Origin of Language, book III chap. VII. and IX.

† Memoires Geograph. Phyſic. et Hiſtoriq. Tom. 5. Ed. Yverdon, 1767, p. 122.

which words are connected together in the ſound as well as the ſenſe, men have contrived to make five millions of words, the number ſuppoſed to be in the Latin language *, comprehenſible in their memories and of ready uſe. This muſt appear very extraordinary to a man who compares the Chineſe written language with ſuch a language as the Latin. The number of Chineſe characters is computed to be no more than 80,000.; and though they have the diſtinction of radical or elemental characters, and of characters derived from theſe †, yet it is a certain fact, that the learned among the Chineſe ſpend a great part of their lives in learning their characters; whereas a boy, in the ſpace of ſeven or eight years, may make himſelf ſo much maſter of the Latin language, as to be able readily to underſtand any author in it, and even to ſpeak it, if he practiſe that alſo.

And, here I conclude what I have to ſay of the *matter* and *form* of a language of art: And, I hope, the reader will not think it improper, that in treating of ſo important a part of the hiſtory of man, as the invention of arts, I ſhould have dwelt ſo long upon the invention of the firſt and greateſt art among men, and which is the foundation of all the other arts of civil life, and of civility itſelf. It is the moſt univerſal art among men, as well as the moſt antient; and, by means of the writing art, it is made the moſt laſting. The knowledge of it alſo leads to the knowledge of many other things concerning our ſpecies, particularly our migrations from one country to another, ſuch as that of the Majars, or Hungarians, as they are now called, from a country ſituated betwixt the Euxine and Caſpian Seas to Hungary and Lapland ‡, and the migration of our anceſtors, the Goths, from Crim Tartary

* This is a computation of Biſhop Wilkins, in his moſt curious work upon language, which he gives us from Varro. See vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 482.

† Pere Du Halde, Tom. 2. p. 226. See alſo the book I have quoted above, *Miſcellaneous Pieces relating to the Chineſe*, vol. I. p. 18.

‡ See vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 138.; and vol. I. p. 394.

Tartary to Germany and the northern kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark *. And there is another thing proved by language, and which is ſtill more intereſting to the philoſopher; and that is the progreſs of the human mind in forming ideas, the materials of all our knowledge. This we learn by the ſtudy of the barbarous languages, which to many may appear a very uſeleſs and trifling ſtudy. But by it we learn what can no otherwiſe be learned, the progreſs of the human mind in the improvement of thoſe two great faculties, the ſource of all our knowledge; I mean, *abſtraction* and *generaliſation*. How defective men were at firſt in the exerciſe of theſe faculties, and how by degrees they improved them, is to be learned only from the ſtudy of barbarous languages.

There is only one thing wanting to make this part of the hiſtory of man compleat; and that is, to diſcover in what country language was firſt invented and formed into an art. This is a ſubject of very curious inquiry, and which will be treated in the next chapter.

CHAP.

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 594.

CHAP. II.

The Queſtion here to be conſidered, is, In what country or countries was a Language of Art invented?—Language not invented by every Nation that ſpeaks it.—This proved by the examples of the Goths, the Laplanders, and the Greenlanders.—As Language is the moſt Antient Art among Men, it muſt have been invented by a very Antient Civiliſed Nation.—Men muſt have been aſſociated, and lived upon the natural fruits of the Earth, before Language or any other Art could have been invented.—A regular Polity neceſſary for that purpoſe, and a claſs of Men ſet apart for it.—Laſtly, Genius and Natural Parts required.—The Egyptian Nation, is that in which all the requiſites above-mentioned for the invention of Arts, concur.

IN the preceding chapter, I think, I have clearly proved, that a Language of Art, of which only I am now ſpeaking, is the greateſt art practiſed by men, and of the moſt difficult invention, at the ſame time of abſolute neceſſity for the invention of other arts and of ſciences, which never could have been invented without ſuch a communication among men, as a language of art, and only a language of art, can produce. We are now to inquire in what country or countries ſuch an art was invented.

That it is not the invention of every people who practiſe it, will readily be admitted. The Goths, for example, a barbarous people, never could have invented a language of more art than any which

is

is at preſent ſpoken in Europe: For it has four caſes of nouns formed by flection; whereas the preſent languages of Europe vary, in that way, only ſome caſes of their pronouns. It is even a more perfect language than the Latin: For it has one part of ſpeech which the Latin wants; I mean the Article. It has alſo two paſt tenſes, the aoriſt and preterperfect; whereas the Latin has but one tenſe for both: And it has a paſt participle paſſive, which the Latin likewiſe wants *. The language of Lapland, of which I have ſpoken elſewhere †, never could have been the invention of ſuch a people as the Laplanders: And, accordingly, we are ſure that it came from a very diſtant country lying far to the eaſt, from whence it came firſt to Hungary, and then from Hungary to Lapland. The Greenlanders are ſtill a more barbarous people than the Laplanders; and yet they have the uſe of a dual number in nouns, which the Latin has not, and form the tenſes of their verbs by flection, and have one tenſe, which the Latin has not, I mean a ſecond future. This I learned as well as other things, which I have mentioned in the courſe of this work, from a grammar of that language, to be found in the King's Library at London.

As languages, therefore, were not invented in every country, but muſt have gone from one country to another, the queſtion is, where they were firſt invented. And, in the *firſt* place, as language is the moſt antient art among men, being the parent art of all other arts and of all ſcience, it is evident, that the nation, which firſt invented it, muſt have been a very antient nation, and the firſt civiliſed nation of this earth.

* This account of the Gothic language, I have got from Mr Thorkelin, who is at preſent Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Copenhagen, but is a native of Iceland, where the Gothic language is ſtill preſerved in the greateſt purity.—See further of the Gothic Language, in vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 552.

† Vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 138.

2*do*, As neither language, nor indeed any art of value, could have been invented, except by men aſſociated together in conſiderable numbers, and living in cloſe intercourſe and communication, it is evident that the country where language was firſt invented, muſt have been ſuch as could enable men to live upon the natural productions of the earth, without even thoſe arts, which we call the neceſſary arts of life: For that men muſt have lived a long time in that way, before theſe arts were invented, I think, is evident; and they muſt have lived, aſſociated, as I have ſaid, and in conſiderable numbers, otherwiſe, I think, no art could have been invented.

3*tio*, For the invention of a language of art, it was alſo neceſſary that men ſhould live not aſſociated only, or even carrying on ſome common buſineſs, but that they ſhould have a regular polity, in which ſome were to command and direct, while others obeyed, ſo that all public buſineſs might be regularly carried on; for, I ſay, that men, living as the ſavages of Paraguay did before the Jeſuits came among them, without any regular government, and every man doing what ſeemed good in his own eyes, never could have invented an art of any value, much leſs an art of language, ſuch as the Sanſcrit or Greek; for the invention of which not only a regular polity was neceſſary, but I think it was further neceſſary, that a claſs or order of the beſt men among the people ſhould be ſet apart for the invention and cultivation of arts. For I hold that arts of ſo difficult invention as that of language, never could have ariſen from common uſe and obſervation of men engaged in the ordinary buſineſs of life.

Laſtly, I require, for the invention of the arts I have mentioned, that the inventors of them ſhould be men of genius, and of very good natural parts: For Nature muſt lay the foundation of all arts and ſciences; and I deny, that ſuch men as the Laplanders and

Greenlanders,

Greenlanders, ſuppoſe they had enjoyed all the other advantages I have mentioned, could have invented a language of art.

Theſe are the things required for the invention of a language of art, ſuch as, I think, it muſt be admitted, are not to be found in every nation which has the uſe of language: And the queſtion now to be conſidered is, whether we can diſcover any very antient nation in which all the things I have mentioned concur. And, I think, there is one to be found in which they all concur; and that is the Egyptian.

CHAP. III.

The Egyptian nation undoubtedly a very antient civiliſed nation.—None can pretend to be ſo antient, except the Indian.—A regular Government among the Egyptians in the moſt antient times.—This atteſted by Moſes.—No other regular Government then known.—Of the wonderful number of Kings there according to Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, from Menes the firſt human King, down to Amaſis.—Of the number of years theſe Kings reigned.—The antient hiſtory of Egypt a matter of curioſity, as well as the antient hiſtory of Greece.—Both to be conſidered as part of the hiſtory of Man.—*The* ſecond *thing required, of a country where language was to be invented, is that it ſhould be abundant of the natural fruits of the earth. This the caſe of Egypt.—The* third *thing required, is a regular government fitted for the invention and cultivation of arts.—This alſo in Egypt.—The laſt thing required, in a country fit for the invention of language, is that the people ſhould have good natural parts.—This alſo the caſe of the Egyptians, as is proved by the authority of ſacred and profane writers.*

THAT the Egyptian was a very antient civiliſed nation, is a fact indiſputable. The moſt antient civiliſed nation at preſent exiſting (for the antient Egyptian nation is now no more) is the Indian, by ſome thought to be more antient than the Egyptian: But I hope I ſhall be able to prove to the readers ſatisfaction, that the Indians got their civility and arts from the Egyptians; and if ſo, there can be no doubt, that the Egyptian is the moſt antient civiliſed nation of which there is any record or tradition. For their antiquity, as a civiliſed nation, we have the authority of Moſes, the moſt antient hiſtorian extant, who tells us, that when Joſeph was in Egypt, the Egyptians

Egyptians were living under a regular government by Kings, with a diviſion of their land, ſuch as is not to be found in any other antient ſtate as far as I know, by which the Prieſts had a certain portion allotted to them *; and I am perſuaded that the King had another portion, and that the whole land was divided in the manner mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, that is, betwixt the King, the church, and the military claſs †: In the ſame manner as by the feudal ſyſtem the land was antiently divided in Britain, and in other kingdoms of Europe. And it is to be obſerved, that while the Egyptians were living under this ſo regular polity, the families of Abraham and Lot, and I ſuppoſe many other families, were vagrants in the plains of Aſia, without being formed into any ſtate. As to the account which the Egyptians themſelves gave from their Sacred books, that is, books kept by their Prieſts, of the antiquity of their nation, we have, in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, a wonderful catalogue of Kings from Menes the firſt human King, down to Amaſis the laſt King before the Perſian Conqueſt, not leſs than 345. And as to the number of years thoſe Kings reigned, the Prieſts told Herodotus, that from Bacchus, one of the third and laſt race of their God-Kings, as they called them, down to this Amaſis, there were 15,000. years; and this they ſaid they knew exactly, by computation of the years of their ſeveral reigns, which were all ſet down in their books ‡: So that the firſt thing I required in the parent country of language, exiſted in Egypt; I mean antient civiliſation, more antient than that of any other nation known.

The

* Geneſis, chap. 47. v. 22.

† Lib. 1. cap. 73.

‡ Και ταυτα Αιγυπτιοι ατρεκεως φασι επισταϑαι, αιει τε λογιζομενοι, και αιει απογραφεμενοι τα ετεα. Lib. 2. cap. 145. With this calculation agrees very well another chronological monument of a very extraordinary kind, and ſuch as I believe no other nation ever had; I mean, the ſtatues of the High Prieſts of Jupiter in Thebes. Of theſe I have ſpoken at ſome length in vol. I. of the Origin of Language, p. 625. of the ſecond edition.

The

The ſecond thing that I required, in the preceding chapter, for a country where language was to be invented, is that it ſhould be a country in which men could live in conſiderable numbers, and in cloſe intercourſe and communication, upon the natural productions of the earth, without even thoſe arts which we call the neceſſary arts of life. Now, there is no country in the world more abundant in thoſe natural productions than Egypt: For men there can ſubſiſt, not only upon the land, but upon the river; and not only upon the fiſh that are taken in it, but upon vegetables which grow in it, and in the marſhes *. And Herodotus tells us, that in his time there was a part of the nation who lived in the marſhes upon the vegetables there produced, without agriculture †.

A third thing I have required, in the country where language was to be invented, is not only that men ſhould be aſſociated together, but that they ſhould live under a regular polity: And particularly that,

The antient hiſtory of Egypt is a matter, I think, of great curioſity, and a very important part of the hiſtory of man. It is a ſubject upon which, and upon the antient hiſtory of Greece, I have a great many ſheets in M. S. Theſe I may ſome time or another publiſh in a volume by itſelf. But it would not be proper to make it any part of a work, ſuch as the preſent, though it may not improperly be conſidered as an appendix to it. In it I will ſhow that the Egyptian chronology, however extraordinary it may appear, is ſupported, as much as any chronology can be, by human monuments: And I will endeavour to account how it comes to be ſo different from the chronology of our Sacred Books.

* See Diodorus, lib. 1. cap. 34. and 43. where he mentions two plants, the *Lotus*, which grew in the river, and of which they made bread before they got the uſe of corn;—and the *Agroſſis*, which grew in their marſhes, upon which they fattened cattle when Diodorus was in Egypt, but upon which they lived when in a wild ſtate: And of this their antient food, Diodorus ſays, the memory was preſerved in their ſacrifices in his time. (dict. cap. 43.).

† Lib. 2. cap. 92.

that, in ſuch a country, a claſs or order of the beſt men among the people, ſhould be ſet apart for the invention and cultivation of arts. Now, in t is reſpect, I ſhall ſhow, when I come to treat of government, that the Egyptian government was the beſt we have ever heard of, and particularly that it was more fitted, than any other, for the invention and cultivation of arts and ſciences.

The laſt thing I required was, that beſides a good form of polity, tending to promote arts and ſciences, the people ſhould have a genius and natural parts which made them fit for the invention and cultivation of arts and ſciences. If that be wanting, though the country have all the other advantages I have mentioned, the people will make very little progreſs in the invention of arts and ſciences. Suppoſe Lapland to be poſſeſſed of all the advantages which I have found in Egypt, I do not believe, that the people there could have invented any art worth mentioning: Nor, do I think, that any of the other countries of Europe, though more favoured by the ſun than Lapland, could, with the genius they have, have made any conſiderable progreſs in the diſcovery of the liberal arts and ſciences: For men of ordinary capacity may be taught or may learn by imitation; but to invent requires more than ordinary underſtanding. Now, that underſtanding the Egyptians had; and were acknowledged, even by the Greeks, to be men of ſuperior parts, as appears from ſeveral paſſages in Herodotus, particularly from that where he relates how the Elians conſulted them about the way they ſhould determine to whom the prizes of their games were to be adjudged*. Moſes, we are told in our Scripture, was *learned in all the wiſdom of the Egyptians* †: And it is ſaid of Solomon's wiſdom, that *it excelled all the wiſdom of Egypt* ‡. The Greeks, however, called

* Herod. lib. 2. cap. 160.

† Acts of the Apoſtles, cap. 7. v. 22.

‡ I. Kings, cap. 4. v. 30.

called the Egyptians as well as other nations, *barbarians*; and ſo the Egyptians called them, for this reaſon, as Herodotus tells us *, that they ſpoke a language different from theirs; and it is in this ſenſe that Homer has uſed the word, when, ſpeaking of a people who fought at Troy, he ſays they were βαρβαροφωνοι †.

And thus I think I have proved, that Egypt was, of all the countries we have heard of, the moſt proper for the invention of language, and of arts and ſciences.

* Herod. lib. 2. cap. 158.

† Iliad, 2. v. 867.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the neceſſity of Arts being invented in Egypt.—Other Arts mentioned as invented in Egypt, beſides the Art of Language:—And, firſt Agriculture, *by which only Men could ſubſiſt in the ſame place in conſiderable numbers, and ſo have a cloſe communication together.—Before this Art was invented, the Egyptians ate one another; and ſo did the Greeks.—This Art came from Egypt to other Countries, and particularly to Attica.—The Art alſo of making Drink, as well as Food, for Men, invented in Egypt,* viz. *the Art of* Fermentation, *by which both Wine and Ale are produced.*

IN a country ſo fitted by nature, and the genius of its inhabitants, for the invention and cultivation of arts and ſciences, and at the ſame time the moſt antient civiliſed country that we read of, it was neceſſary that many arts and ſciences ſhould be invented; and I am now to ſhow, that among others was invented the art of language, the foundation of all arts and ſciences. But before I come to ſpeak of it particularly, I will give an account of other arts and ſciences that were invented in Egypt, the original country, in my opinion, of all arts and ſciences. I will begin with Agriculture, which may be ſaid to be the parent art, which has produced all other arts, and all ſciences: For the practice of this art makes it neceſſary that men ſhould live together in one place and in conſiderable numbers; and by the fruits it produces, it enables them to do ſo. Accordingly, the Egyptians lived by means of this art in greater numbers than I believe ever any people did in the ſame extent of country, and likewiſe in the cloſeſt communication and intercourſe; for they lived in cities. Now, it is only people ſo aſſociated, and

with ſuch communication and intercourſe, who are capable of inventing arts and ſciences: For the men who lead the nomade life, and ſubſiſt upon the natural fruits of the earth, or like the beaſts of prey, upon what they can catch by hunting, though they may have got the uſe of language from other countries, never can invent any art worth the mentioning, and no ſcience at all; and the reaſon is plain, that they muſt go from place to place in ſearch of food, and cannot have that cloſe communication and intercourſe, by which alone the human mind is cultivated, and made capable of producing arts and ſciences. And though they had the capacity of inventing them, which I think they could not have, they are ſo much employed in procuring ſubſiſtance, that they have not time for it. For in every country where arts and ſciences are to be invented and cultivated, there muſt be men who have leiſure for that purpoſe, and are exempted from the neceſſity of procuring ſubſiſtance for themſelves, which was the caſe of the Prieſts in Egypt. And, accordingly, there is no example in the hiſtory of mankind of men living the nomade life, inventing any art or ſcience, though they may have had the uſe of ſome arts, which they got from other nations leading the ſedentary life.

Before Agriculture was invented, the Egyptians lived upon the natural produce of their land and river, which, I have obſerved elſewhere, was more abundant in Egypt than in any other country whatever *. And there were particularly two plants upon which they chiefly fed before they diſcovered the uſe of corn. Theſe were the *Lotus*, and a plant they called, *Agroſtis*; both I believe the gift of the river, which the Lotus certainly was. The Agroſtis in later times was uſed for fattening cattle: But the memory of its having been uſed for the food of men was preſerved in their ſolemn ſacrifices †. Men multiplied, as it appears, ſo faſt, that the natural

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 649. and 650.

† See Diodorus Siculus concerning this plant, lib. 1. cap. 34. where he ſpeaks alſo of the Lotus, of which he ſays they made bread.

tural fruits of the country, however abundant, could not maintain them. And, therefore, as Diodorus informs us *, they ate one another: So that, even the Egyptians, the moſt antient and beſt civiliſed nation of the world, as, I think, I ſhall prove in the ſequel of this work, were once as barbarous man-eaters as the people of Paraguay; and ſo were the Greeks, (the fineſt nation in the world, in my opinion, next to the Egyptians), as Horace tells us, when Orpheus came from Egypt to civiliſe them †. This ſhows that barbarity, and even the eating one another, when other food cannot be found, is a neceſſary ſtep in the progreſs of men from the natural to the civiliſed life; and that it is only by arts, and a regular polity, that men can be tamed and humaniſed, as the Paraguaiſe were by the Jeſuits.

In this barbarous way the Egyptians lived, till Iſis, the ſiſter and wife of Oſiris, diſcovered wheat and barley, which, as Diodorus tells us, were the natural produce of the country, (as I am inclined to believe, every plant which the earth produces was to be found in a country ſo fruitful as Egypt), and grew with other herbs, but were not known by the inhabitants till Iſis diſcovered them as plants the moſt proper for nouriſhing men ‡; the memory of

 which

* Diodorus, lib. 1. cap. 14.

† See p. 95. of this volume, where I quote two lines of Horace, to which may be added, the third following,

Dictus ab hoc lenire tygres rabidoſque leones;

for, I think, the Greeks when Orpheus came among them, as the Paraguaiſe before they were civiliſed by the Jeſuits, may be very properly compared to tygers and lions; and, indeed, men in ſuch a ſtate, are, by their natural ſagacity, with the addition of ſome arts, which they may have invented or got from other countries, animals more formidable than tygers and lions.

‡ Diodorus, lib. 1. cap. 14.

which was preſerved in Egypt, even in his time, by offering to this Goddeſs the firſt fruits of theſe plants, in the beginning of their harveſt. Diodorus, it may be obſerved, mentions only wheat and barley. But there was another grain in Egypt, which they called *Zea*, and which, as the Halicarnaſſian tells us, was the *Far* of the Romans. This grain was a much finer grain than the common wheat, though I believe of the ſame genus; for which reaſon it is likely that it is not diſtinguiſhed by Diodorus from wheat. But Herodotus has made the diſtinction, and informed us, that the better ſort of people in Egypt ate no bread but what was made of the *Zea* or *Olyron*, as it was likewiſe called *. Whether theſe plants were then produced in any other country in the world, I will not take upon me to determine, though I incline to believe that they were not. But one thing is certain, that the culture of them firſt began in Egypt, and from thence was carried to different parts of the world †. So that the bread we eat at preſent, I am perſuaded, we owe to this Goddeſs Iſis, or Ceres, as ſhe was called by the Romans,

——cujus munere tellus
Chaoniam pingui glandem mutavit ariſtâ ‡.

for, in other countries, where they had not ſuch plants as the *lotus* and the *agroſtis*, the men were obliged to live upon acorns, as we are told the Arcadians did in antient times, and no doubt many more nations did, in countries where they could find that fruit.

The firſt people in Europe, that this gift of the Goddeſs came to, were

* Herod. lib. 2. cap. 36.

† The fineſt kind of wheat, or Zea, is not to be found at preſent, as I am informed, any where in Europe except in Sicily. From thence I wonder that we do not get the ſeed of it, and try to cultivate it in Britain.

‡ *Georgic.* Virgil. in initio.

were the Athenians, to whom the ſeeds of the ſeveral corns, I have mentioned, were brought by an Egyptian woman, whom the Athenians made to be Ceres herſelf; and perhaps ſhe might have aſſumed that name. She inſtituted thoſe moſt reſpectable myſteries called the Eluſinian. From Athens corn was ſent to the ſeveral cities of Greece, which was acknowledged by an annual oblation of their firſt fruits, ſent by thoſe cities to Athens *.

As by Iſis a plant was diſcovered which furniſhed bread to man, ſo by Oſiris, her huſband and brother, an art was invented of making a drink for man. This art is what is called *fermentation*, which he applied to the juice of the grape; and ſo firſt made wine, which though it has been very much abuſed, (as almoſt every production of nature and art has been by man), and therefore is very properly ſtilled by Milton, *The ſweet poiſon of miſuſed Wine*, may be applied to the moſt uſeful purpoſes; for it is the beſt cordial of old age, and at all times of life it enlivens the ſpirits, and therefore Bacchus is called by Virgil, *Lætitiæ dator*, and it cheriſhes the ſtomach. But it is a great abuſe of this liquor in modern times, to drink it pure without mixture of water, which I am ſorry to obſerve ſo much practiſed in Britain, where port, a wine full as ſtrong as the beſt Greek wine, the Chian, (as I am informed by a gentlemam who has been in Greece, and often drank of that wine), is drunk without any mixture of water, which makes it very inflammatory and intoxicating: Whereas wine, properly mixed with water, is a much better drink than pure water, for it corrects the coldneſs and crudity of the water, and I am perſuaded invigorates the ſtomach, and makes it more eaſily digeſt that unnatural diet, as I call it, *fleſh*. It is therefore true what Solomon has ſaid, *That wine without water is not good, nor water without wine; but both together make an excellent*

* Iſocratis, *Panegyric.*

*excellent drink**. The antient Greeks and Romans, as they did not drink wine without water, ſo neither did they drink water without wine, if they could get wine; and the Roman ſoldier, who could not afford wine, rather than drink pure water, mixed vinegar with it, and made of it a liquor called *Poſca*. Virgil therefore has very properly deſcribed the uſe of wine, when, ſpeaking of Bacchus, he has ſaid,

Poculaque inventis Acheloïa miſcuit uvis.

The antient Greeks therefore never drank it pure, even in the heroic ages, when they were ſo much bigger and ſtronger than in after times: The Romans alſo mixed it with water; and Horace calls loudly for it,

——Quis puer ocyus
Reſtinguet ardentis Falerni
Pocula prætereunte lympha?——Od. 11. Lib. 2.

nor do we hear of a Vitellius, a Heliogabalus, or any other of their moſt luxurious Emperors, drinking pure wine. In thoſe antient times, therefore, it was only Scythians or other barbarians who drank pure wine: And we read of a Scythian†, who, happening to be at Sparta, became acquainted with one of the Kings, whom he taught to drink pure wine; the conſequence of which was, that, though he was of the race of Hercules, the ſtrongeſt race of men then known in the world, he died raving mad, and tearing his own fleſh.

There was another fermented liquor invented in Egypt, whether by Oſiris or by whom elſe I cannot tell; but it is well known to us under the name of *ale* or *beer*, a liquor made of barley, which, before it is fermented, undergoes a proceſs, a greater diſcovery, I think, than even fermentation; I mean the operation of malting, by which the grain is in ſome degree putrified; and hence it was

* The laſt verſe of the Apocrypha.

† Herodot. lib. 6. cap. 84.

was called by the Romans, *Vinum ex corruptis frugibus.* It was the drink of the common people in Egypt, where wine was ſcarce, the ground being all employed in producing corn to maintain ſuch numbers of men. And thus it appears, that we owe to the Egyptians, not only *corn* and *wine*, but alſo *ale*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the invention of Clothes.—Theſe not neceſſary in the Natural Life.—The firſt Clothing among Men were Skins.—The country of Egypt maintaining ſo many Men, could not likewiſe maintain ſo many Beaſts as were neceſſary for furniſhing Skins to Cloth ſo many People.—Therefore Clothing by Linen invented;—alſo by Cloth made of Wool;—for both theſe Clothings, the Arts of Spinning and Weaving were neceſſary.—The uſe of Linen went from Egypt to few countries.—To the Egyptians therefore we owe not only our Bread, our Wine, and our Beer, but our Cloths.—The Egyptians muſt have diſcovered the uſe of Fire for the practice of theſe Arts.—This diſcovery not made by all nations in the firſt ages of Civility.—Of the Art of Building invented in Egypt:—Metallurgy neceſſary for the practiſe of that Art.—The Egyptians made the ſubject of their art, not only every thing on the earth, and in the air and water, but what was in the bowels of the earth.—The way that Men were ſupplied with inſtruments of peircing hard ſubſtances, before the invention of Metals.—Diviſion of Time into certain portions neceſſary in Civiliſed Life.—The firſt diviſion of time into Days, that is, the interval from one riſing of the Sun to his riſing again.—The next portion of Time, obſerved by Men, was from one new moon to another, called from thence a Month.—This the only diviſion of Time known to barbarous nations.—The Solar Year firſt diſcovered in Egypt.—That year, as firſt uſed by the Greeks and Romans, very irregular.—The Romans got the irregularity of their year corrected from Egypt.—What was wanting to make that correction perfectly accurate, ſupplied by Pope Gregory XIII.—Of the diviſion of time into Weeks.—This invented

ed in Egypt, and by the Egyptians carried to India.—From the Egyptians it came to Greece, and from Greece to us.

IN this chapter I will continue the account, I began in the laſt, of thoſe arts of life invented in Egypt, which are neceſſary for man in the civiliſed ſtate. Of Agriculture, the great art of that kind, I have treated in the laſt chapter; of the produce of which, *Corn*, I have ſhown that the Egyptians taught both to make food and drink. I am now to ſpeak of ſome other arts, invented in Egypt, which are likewiſe neceſſary in the civiliſed life. And I will begin with *Cloaths*, which are not neceſſary in the natural ſtate, as it is now well known, that men go naked in the coldeſt climates, ſuch as that of an iſland a degree further ſouth than the Straits of Magellan, where Sir Francis Drake ſaw men without cloaths. The firſt cloathing uſed by men was undoubtedly the ſkins of beaſts; and in that way Adam and Eve were firſt cloathed. But the Egyptians contrived to make cloathing of a vegetable, I mean, *Flax*, of which they made what is ſo much celebrated in ſcripture, under the name of *the fine linen of Egypt*; the uſe of which is now ſo prevalent in Europe, that the meaneſt of the people not only wear it through the day, but ſleep in it at night. But to the Greeks and Romans it was not at all known, and Auguſtus Cæſar had not a linen ſhirt upon his back; nor in antient times does it appear, that this diſcovery went to any other nation except the Jews. In Egypt it was abſolutely neceſſary that they ſhould have ſuch a cloathing, as the country, maintaining ſo many men, could not at the ſame time ſupport ſo many beaſts as were neceſſary for cloathing the tenth part of the people. The Egyptians at the ſame time knew alſo the uſe of wool for cloathing, and uſed woollen cloth as well as linen: But for making both it was neceſſary that they ſhould invent the art of ſpinning and weaving. To them therefore we owe our Cloathing, as well as our Bread, our Wine and Beer.

As Egypt was the firſt civilized country, I think it is certain that the Egyptians muſt have firſt diſcovered the uſe of *fire*, without which none of the arts of Vulcan or Minerva could have been practiſed. That it was not known to all nations, even in the firſt ages of civilization, and after they had learned the uſe of ſpeech, is evident from the example of the men of the Ladrone Iſlands, who had not the uſe of it when they were firſt diſcovered by the Europeans: And the Wild Girl, I ſaw in France, told me that they had no uſe of it in her country*. But whether the antient Egyptians had learned to ſtrike fire out of the veins of flint, to uſe an expreſſion of Virgil, which the Chineſe have not learned at this day, does not appear.

Not only were bread, and wine, and beer, which are uſed in the civilized life, and alſo cloaths, invented by the Egyptians, but likewiſe *houſes* and other buildings of ſtone, of which wonderful monuments are ſtill to be ſeen in Egypt. Before the invention of houſes, men lodged in caves, or dug for themſelves habitations in rocks†, ſuch as thoſe to be ſeen at this day in ſome parts of the world, particularly in the Iſland of Elephantis off the coaſt of Bombay ‡. But before the Egyptians could raiſe buildings of ſtone, they muſt have diſcovered, as I have ſaid, the uſe of *fire*, and learned the practice of Metallurgy. So that, not content with converting to their uſe every thing that the land, the water, and air furniſhed, they dug into the bowels of the earth, and from thence, beſides many other things, they brought metals, of which,

* Of the uſe of fire being unknown to ſeveral nations, ſee p. 38. of vol. III. of this work.

† See p. 44 of this vol.

‡ See further what I have ſaid on this ſubject, in vol. III. of this work, p. 83. where I have acknowledged, that what I have learned concerning that iſland, I owe to Dr Lind now of Windſor, who ſhowed me a plan of the extraordinary excavations there.

which, by a wonderful application of the element of fire, they made a variety of things both of ornament and uſe. Before this diſcovery, men, for the purpoſe of cutting and piercing, uſed the hardeſt ſtones they could find, ſuch as flints; and the barbarous nations at this day head their arrows with flints, which was the practice in Scotland in antient times as well as in other countries; and I have myſelf a flint head of an arrow, found in the Pentland Hills near Edinburgh.

For carrying on the buſineſs of civil life, and particularly of agriculture, the obſervance of times and ſeaſons is neceſſary, and for that purpoſe the diviſion of time into certain portions. The moſt obvious diviſion, and no doubt the firſt that was made by men, is into *days*; that is the interval of time from the riſing of the ſun in one day, to his riſing again the next day; which we divide into twenty-four parts called hours. But a greater diviſion of time was neceſſary for the buſineſs of life: And therefore the next diviſion of it, made by man, was by the motions of the moon, containing that ſpace of time betwixt the one new moon and the other; which we call a *month*: And the barbarous nations appear to have gone no farther, than to divide their time by months and by ſeaſons; for none of them, unleſs they have learned it from us, know that diviſion of time we call a *year*. This ſo important diviſion, without which we could have had no chronology of any extent of time, was firſt invented by the Egyptians, as Herodotus has told us *. They diſcovered that the courſe of the ſun round the earth, or, what is the ſame thing, of the earth round the ſun, is performed in 365 days and 6 hours, which hours every fourth year make a day more, that was added to that year. And here we are to obſerve, that though the Egyptians did not lay aſide the diviſion of time into months, it was not lunar months, but months ſuch as we

* Lib. 2. chap. 4.

uſe, each of a certain number of days: Whereas the Greeks, dividing the year into twelve lunar months of about 29 days each, were obliged, in order to adjuſt their year to the motions of the ſun, to intercallate a month every third year *. And among the Romans, Numa for the ſame reaſon intercallated a month of 22 days every two years †. But notwithſtanding this reformation made by Numa, the Roman callendar went into ſuch diſorder, that Julius Caeſar, in order to rectify it, was obliged to intercallate, firſt 23 days, and then 67, making altogether an intercallation of no leſs than 90 days ‡; and having thus adjuſted the year to the courſe of the ſun, in order to prevent its going into diſorder again, he adopted the Egyptian year as above deſcribed. This reformation of the Roman callendar, Julius made by the directions of Soſigenes, an Egyptian aſtronomer, who came from Alexandria; and it is this year which is now uſed all over Europe, with a ſmall alteration made in it, in the 16th century, by Pope Gregory XIII. What made this alteration neceſſary was, that the 6 hours added, as ſaid is, to the 365 days, exceeded the ſolar year by 11 minutes. This exceſs, in the courſe of ſo many centuries, made a diſconformity betwixt the ſolar and civil year, which was rectified by that Pope; and it is ſaid, that Julius Cæſar, if he had lived longer, would have made that amendment himſelf, by the direction, no doubt, of the ſame Soſigines. So that the Egyptians knew the true ſolar year to a minute; and thus it appears, that to them we owe, among many other things, the diſcovery of the ſolar year, and the diviſion of it into months, which are adapted to the ſeaſons of the year; ſo that the ſame months are always vernal, ſummer, autumnal, and winter months.

The Egyptians had another diviſion of time, unknown to the Greeks

* Herodotus, *ubi ſupra.*

† Gebelin, vol. IV. p. 153.

‡ Ibid. p. 163.

Greeks and Romans till later times: I mean the diviſion into weeks; which was carried by Oſiris into India, whereit is at this day in uſe; and, what is very remarkable, the ſeven days of the week are in India not only conſecrated to the ſeven planets, but each day to the ſame planet as among us. But this diviſion of time was for many ages only known to the Egyptians, Jews, and Indians; but not to the Greeks till latter times, as Dion Caſſius informs us; and from them we got it. I will only add further upon this ſubject, that this ſo ſingular diviſion of time, which was not founded in the neceſſities of life, like the other diviſions that I have mentioned, but took its riſe from the religion of the Egyptians, who, as Herodotus tells us, conſecrated every day to ſome deity or another, being uſed in India, is a proof I think demonſtrative, if there were no other, that the Egyptians were in India. But of this, I ſhall ſay a great deal more in the ſequel of this work.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Religion, and the neceſſity of it to conſtitute and carry on a good polity.—The opinion of Mr David Hume upon this ſubject, very different from that of Cicero.—Religion not known to Man *in his natural ſtate,—nor in the firſt age of civility.—This proved, firſt by* Reaſon, *and then by* Facts,—*and firſt as to* Reaſon.—*It ſhows that* Man *in the natural ſtate can have no ideas at all; and, in the beginning of civility, only ideas of corporeal ſubſtances,—but no ideas of inviſible powers acting upon body, without which there can be no idea of God.—This idea only to be acquired in proceſs of time after the invention of different arts.—Secondly as to* Facts; *it is proved by the example of the Orang Outang,—Peter the Wild Boy,—the Wild Girl in France,—the people of the Pelew Iſlands,—thoſe of New Zealand—of New Holland, and particularly of Botany Bay.—Objection anſwered, from the example of the Indians of North America, who have got the notion of a great ſpirit.—This they muſt have got from a people further advanced in arts and civility, who are proved by monuments ſtill exiſting to have been once in that country.—That the idea of a God, is not an innate idea;—no innate ideas of any kind.*

IN the preceding chapter I have treated of arts, which are abſolutely neceſſary, or of great conveniency in the civiliſed life: And I am next to ſpeak of two things, which are of abſolute neceſſity for conſtituting and carrying on a regular polity. The two things I mean are *Religion* and *Government*; and firſt as to Religion. "The fear of God," as our ſcripture tells us, "is the beginning

"of

" of wiſdom." Without that fear, I hold, there is no real wiſdom or ſound underſtanding among men ; and, therefore, that, without religion, there never was nor ever will be formed, or carried on, any polity in the leaſt degree perfect.—So far I differ in opinion from our philoſopher Mr David Hume, who has thought proper to inform the public, that the leſs religion there is in any country, ſo much the better for that country *. Cicero was ſo much of a different opinion, that he thought the chief praiſe he could beſtow upon his countrymen, was, that, however they might be excelled by other nations in other things which he names, *ſed pietate ac religione, atque hac una ſapientia, quod Deorum immortalium numine omnia regi gubernarique perſpeximus, omnes gentes nationeſque ſuperavimus* †. And I am perſuaded it was to their religion chiefly that they owed the conqueſt of the world : For it was their religion, and particularly their moſt religious regard to an oath, which made them ſo good citizens and ſoldiers ‡.

I am, however, of opinion, that religion was not known to man in his natural ſtate, nor even in the firſt ages of civility, but was diſcovered by him, like other things, in proceſs of time, as he improved in underſtanding. And this is a truth not only proved by fact and obſervation, as I ſhall afterwards ſhow, but I think is evident from theory, and may be demonſtrated in this manner.

Men in the mere natural ſtate have no ideas at all, but only the capacity of forming them. They have therefore only the perceptions of ſenſe. From theſe perceptions, when they are a little advanced in civility and arts, they form, by abſtraction and generaliſation, ideas in the manner I have elſewhere ſhown §. But their firſt ideas were only of

* See vol. II. of this work, p. 301.; and ſee further concerning the philoſophy of Mr Hume, vol. I. p. 309.

† Oratio, *de Haruſpicum reſponſis*.

‡ See what I have further ſaid on this ſubject, in vol. V. of Origin of Language, p. 9.

§ Page 65. and 66. of this volume

of corporeal ſubſtances, and of their operations upon one another. In this way, they diſcovered a difference of bodies, and that one body acts upon another. But it is impoſſible that at firſt they can have any idea of an inviſible and immaterial principle acting upon body, and in that way conducting the operations of nature, and influencing the affairs of human life. Now, a man who has no idea of this kind, can have no religion, which can only come in proceſs of time, by obſerving that there are inviſible powers infinitely ſuperior to any power that he can exert, by which all the wonderful phænomena of nature are produced. It may be ſaid that man, by conſidering himſelf and his own powers of action, might diſcover that there was an inviſible power within himſelf, which moved him to action. But a ſavage cannot practiſe that precept of the wiſe man in Greece, *Know thyſelf*, which was inſcribed on the frontiſpiece of the temple at Delphi, and was underſtood to be an addreſs by the God to thoſe who came to viſit his temple*. Some I am affraid, even of our modern philoſophers, know ſo little of themſelves, as not to know that the principle, which moves their bodies, is an immaterial principle †. Religion therefore muſt have come among men only in proceſs of time, after they had lived together for a conſiderable time in a well regulated ſociety, and had not only invented ſome of the neceſſary arts of life, but had learned to reaſon and to ſpeculate upon cauſes and effects. And indeed, to me it is inconceivable, how a creature only capable of intellect, which is the caſe of man in his natural ſtate, ſhould immediately upon acquiring the uſe of it, without the exerciſe of it for ſome conſiderable time upon different ſubjects, form an idea of the Supreme Intelligence, or of intelligences ſuperior to his own, or even of his own.

This

* See p. 8. of this vol. See alſo Plutarch in his Treatiſe upon the Inſcription of EI. on the entry to the temple at Delphi.

† Vol. V. of Origin of Language, p. 422. and 423.

This theory of mine is ſupported by facts: The Orang Outang has certainly no religion; and if the reader be not yet convinced of his being a man, Peter the Wild Boy, of whoſe humanity there never was any doubt, had no idea of a God *, though he was tamed and domeſticated, and lived very quietly in a family, where I ſaw him, and had learned a little language. Him, however, as well as the Orang Outang, I conſider in the natural ſtate. The Savage Girl, whom I ſaw in France, came from a country where they not only had the uſe of language, but practiſed ſome of the arts of life, particularly fiſhing, in the natural way indeed, I mean by their hands, but ſo that they lived by it. But, from the converſations I had with her, I could not learn that they had the leaſt idea of religion. And the people of the Pelew Iſlands, though much farther advanced in the arts of life, have none neither, as far as we could diſcover during the 13 weeks we were among them; though, during that time, we appear to have informed ourſelves of their government, and the arts of war and navigation which they practiſe; and as there is no religion in any nation, without religious ceremonies and forms of worſhip, theſe we muſt have alſo obſerved, if there had been any ſuch among them. The people of New Zealand appear to be ſtill farther advanced in the arts of life; for they have not only the uſe of language, but are orators and public ſpeakers †, and are a generous noble-minded people, as well as the Pelew men; yet neither have we diſcovered any religion among them. The Indian nations of North America have notions of religion, which they carry ſo far as to acknowledge *a Great Spirit*, in whoſe name they make their treaties of peace. But, in the firſt place, I ſay, thoſe nations are much farther advanced in the arts of civil life than any of the people above-mentioned; and, *ſecondly*, I ſay, that even this further progreſs would not have carried them on to the conception of a Supreme Being, if they had not learned it from a people much

* See p. 371. of vol. III. of this work.

† See p. 4. of vol. VI. of Origin of Language.

farther advanced in arts and ſciences, who appear once to have inhabited the country of North America. Of ſuch a people, memorials have been obſerved by travellers in that country, particularly by Adair, who was 40 years there, trading with the different nations of North America, and appears to me to be a man of veracity and accurate obſervation. He ſays, in his hiſtory of the American Indians *, that, in certain parts of North America, there are to be ſeen plates of copper and of braſs, to the number of ſeven, five of copper and two of braſs; and particularly of the braſs, he ſays, that they are round in their ſhape like a medal, and have upon them two ſtars and an alphabetical character, at leaſt it ſo appears, reſembling the character by which we mark the Æ diphthong in Latin. This Author likewiſe ſpeaks † of the remains of regular encampments to be ſeen in this country: And the ſame was obſerved by Carver, when he was there, as he has related in his travels through the interior parts of North America ‡.

Thus I have proved both *a priori* by the reaſon of the thing, and *a poſteriori* by facts, that religion does not belong to man in his natural ſtate, and not even in the firſt ages of civility, but that he acquires it, as he does arts and ſciences, by the cultivation of his intellectual faculties. There are ſome, I know, who think that the idea of a God, is an innate idea in man. But ſuch men do not know, any more than Mr Locke and Mr David Hume, what ideas are, but confound them with ſenſations; from which, no doubt, our ideas are formed in the manner I have elſewhere deſcribed, (for in this ſtate of our exiſtence, all our knowledge ariſes from our ſenſes); but they are quite different from our ſenſations, as different as intellect is from ſenſe, generals from particulars, and man from brute.

CHAP.

* Adair, p. 178.

† Ibid. 377.

‡ Carver, p. 56.

CHAP. VII.

Impoſſible that the Egyptians, who had invented ſo many arts and ſciences, ſhould not have been Religious.—They were the moſt Religious of all Nations. Religion here conſidered as a Political Inſtitution, which produced no bad effects among the Egyptians, as it has done in many other Nations.—If it produced no bad effects, where there was ſo much of it as in Egypt, it muſt have produced good effects.—Difference betwixt the Religion of Egypt and that of other Countries.—In other countries the Gods only predicted events; in Egypt they were Kings, and Governed.—Of the nature of the Egyptian Gods.—They were embodied, were born, and died; and were of different Characters.—They were of that claſs of Beings called Dæmons.—This opinion ſupported by the authority of Plutarch, Plato, and other Authors quoted by him.—Proved from theory that ſuch Beings as Dæmons muſt exiſt, otherwiſe there would be a void in the univerſe, which cannot be ſuppoſed to be in ſo perfect a Syſtem.—Agreeable to the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, that ſuch Beings ſhould be ſent among men, to aſſiſt them to recover from their fallen State, by teaching them Arts and Sciences.—This was done by the Dæmons in Egypt.—This happened in other countries as well as in Egypt, particularly in China and in Peru.—In Peru there was an Oſiris and an Iſis, under the name of Manco Capuc and his Siſter-wife.—Authorities from Scripture to prove the exiſtence of Dæmons.—They may be ſuppoſed to have been the Beings called, in Scripture, Angels, who had the ſuperintendency of human affairs.—Each Nation had its Angel.—A bad tranſlation of a text on this ſubject in our Bible.—The Sons of God, *who, we are told, copulated with the Daughters of Men, muſt have been Dæmons.—This in-*

terpretation of the text ſupported by the authority of the Fathers of the Church.—It was natural that thoſe Dæmons in Egypt ſhould be the objects of Popular Worſhip there;—but the Learned Egyptians made a diſtinction betwixt the Popular Religion and the Religion of Philoſophers.—Proof of this from their knowing the doctrine of the Trinity.—A great deal of Rites, Ceremonies, and Pomp in the Popular Religion of Egypt.—The ſame in the Religions of Greece and Rome,—alſo in the Religion of the Jews.—Proof of this from Scripture.—Muſic a conſiderable part of the Religion of all Antient Nations;—very much attended to by the Egyptians.—The Antient Muſic among them carefully preſerved.—Of the Oracles in Egypt.—By them only the Egyptians divined.—From them Oracles came to Greece, but not to the Romans, who divined only by the Flight of Birds and Entrails of Beaſts.—Of the Egyptian Oracles.—Theſe were given by the Dæmons who had Reigned over them;—difference in that reſpect betwixt the Oracles of Egypt and of Greece, as well as betwixt the Gods of Egypt and of Greece.—Of the deceit and impoſture of the Greek Oracles.—Of the Sacred Animals among the Egyptians.—Theſe were types of their Divinities.—Better repreſentations of Divinity than any thing inanimate, ſuch as Braſs or Stone.—By means of theſe Sacred Animals, the Egyptians lived with their Gods, more than any other People;—and were the moſt Religious of all People;—and alſo the Happieſt.—Obſervations upon the difference betwixt the Religion of the Philoſopher and the Vulgar.—A Religion of contemplation, ſuch as that of the Philoſopher, not fit for an uninſtructed Mind.

HAVING ſhown in the preceding chapter, that men muſt not only have been civiliſed, but have made ſome progreſs in arts and ſciences before they could be religious, in this chapter I propoſe to inquire concerning the religion of Egypt.

That

That men, who had conſtituted ſo perfect a polity, as I ſhall ſhow the Egyptian was, who had alſo invented thoſe arts which I have ſhown the Egyptians invented, and other arts and likewiſe ſciences, of which I ſhall ſpeak in the ſequel, ſhould not have diſcovered, that there were, in this univerſe, beings of power and of wiſdom infinitely ſuperior to man, is a thing very impoſſible, and indeed, in my apprehenſion, abſolutely incredible. But the matter does not reſt upon theory or argument: For it is a fact uncontravertible, that they were a moſt religious nation, I believe as religious a nation as ever exiſted: Herodotus ſays, the moſt religious of all nations *.

Whether their religion was what may be called a true religion, is not the buſineſs of this part of my work to inquire; for I here conſider religion only as a political inſtitution; and I inquire, *firſt*, Whether religion among the Egyptians produced ſuch bad conſequences, as it is known to have produced among other nations, ſuch as that abomination of human ſacrifices, which we know were practiſed in other nations, particularly among the Carthaginians †, likewiſe among the Greeks, the Cananites, and even the Jews. But among the Egyptians, ſuch an abomination was abhored, and was never practiſed, as Herodotus has told us ‡. In other nations religion has produced, particularly in modern times, great diſorders in the ſtate, civil wars, perſecutions, and maſſacres. But we hear of no ſuch effects of religion in Egypt. *Secondly*, If religion, ſo much as there was in Egypt, produces no bad effects, it muſt neceſſarily produce ſome good; for it is impoſſible that it can be a thing indifferent. I therefore hold it to be certain, that the piety of the Egyptians muſt have had a great effect upon their morals, and made them better citizens and ſubjects than otherwiſe they would have been; for

* Lib. 2. cap. 37.

† Diodorus. lib. 20. cap. 24. where he tells us, that the Carthaginians, upon one occaſion, ſacrificed 500 children, of their nobleſt families, to appeaſe the wrath of Saturn.

‡ Lib. 2. cap. 119.

for they believed, as much as any people ever did, in a *preſent diety*; and may be ſaid to have lived with their Gods.

In one reſpect the Egyptian religion differed from any other that we read of. In other countries their Gods predicted events, and in that way governed the councils of the kings and rulers: But in Egypt their Gods, in very antient times, were their kings: And there were three races of them, as Herodotus tells us; the firſt, conſiſting of *eight* Gods; the ſecond, of *twelve*; and the third, and laſt, of *three*; and after them came their human Kings, of whom the firſt was Menes. And this leads to a curious inquiry, what kind of beings theſe God-kings, as they called them, were.

And, in the *firſt* place, it is certain, that they had bodies, ſuch as we have, and were not immortal, but died as we do, though their life was much longer. *Secondly*, As they died, ſo they were born, and were produced in the ordinary way by generation; but they mixed in that way only with one another: From the firſt race therefore proceeded the ſecond; and from the ſecond the third, in the common way of generation. They did not therefore mix with the women of the country, and beget Heroes, as the Greek Gods did; for Heroes were not known among the Egyptians; and Herodotus tells us, that they did not live with the men of the country, but among themſelves. *Thirdly*, Though they were neither Gods nor immortal, they were much ſuperior to men in council and intelligence. And, *laſtly*, they were not all of them good and virtuous beings, but one of them was a murderer and a villain, he who was called Typhon.

To what claſs of beings then ſhall we ſay they belonged, and what name ſhall we give them? And I think Plutarch has very properly deſcribed and named them, when he ſays, that they were not

not Gods, but *Dæmons*, that is, beings intermediate betwixt Gods and men. This opinion he gives after informing us, that there were ſome, who thought that they were mere men, who aſſumed divine honours, and were conſidered as Gods by the Egyptians, on account of the many benefits they had conferred on them by the diſcovery of ſo many arts. His own opinion he ſupports by the authority of Plato, Pythagoras *, Xenocrates, and Chryſippus, who, in conformity with the antient theologiſts, maintained that ſuch beings exiſted, much ſuperior to man, and participated, in ſome degree, of the divine nature, but not pure and unmixed. Plato, he tells us, ſays, that they were placed in the middle betwixt Gods and men, and kept up a communication betwixt theſe two, carrying to the Gods the prayers and ſupplications of men, and bringing from the Gods, to men, predictions of future events, and gifts of good things. And he quotes Empedocles, the philoſopher, who ſays, that ſome of thoſe Dæmons were wicked, and committed crimes, which they expiated by certain puniſhments; and then they recovered the rank they had loſt †. After this, Plutarch gives us the opinions of thoſe philoſophers, who allegoriſed the Egyptian divinities, ſuch as Iſis and Oſiris, and interpreted them to denote parts and powers of nature ‡. But the allegories of thoſe authors he rejects, and gives what he himſelf thinks a better allegory §; for allegoriſing had come much into faſhion at the time that Plutarch wrote; ſo that both the Egyptian and Greek theology were allegoriſed;

* That it was the opinion of Pythagoras, that there was a claſs of beings that dwelt on earth, but were of a nature ſuperior to man, is evident from the *aurea carmina* of Pythagoras, in which thay are called, δαιμονες καταχθονιοι, (v. 2.) and the commentary of Hierocles upon that verſe, p. 38. edit. Needham.

† Plutarch, de *Iſide et Oſiride*, p. 360. and 361 of the Paris edition, vol. II.

‡ Ibid. p. 363.

§ Ibid. p. 373.

allegoriſed; and in later times even hiſtorical facts; and there is a late French writer who has made Romulus, the firſt King of Rome, to be a ſymbol of the ſun. But that thoſe Dæmon Kings of Egypt were real perſonages as much as Menes, their firſt human King, neither Herodotus nor Diodorus Siculus appear to have the leaſt doubt; nor Plutarch himſelf, as he has told us in expreſs terms, that they were Dæmons, and held a middle place betwixt Gods and men. So that I hold the reign of the Gods in Egypt to be as much a part of the antient hiſtory of that country, as the reigns of their human Kings, and atteſted in the ſame manner by the books of the prieſts.

That ſuch beings as Dæmons do exiſt, is, I think, evident from theory, though it were not atteſted by hiſtory; for it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe, that the great interval betwixt an intellectual creature ſuch as man, and the ſupreme intelligence, ſhould not be filled up by intelligences ſuperior to man, but inferior by infinite degrees to the ſupreme. Some of theſe we may ſuppoſe to be cloathed with ſuch bodies as ours, which was the caſe of the Egyptian Dæmon Kings. Others we may ſuppoſe to be, like the Dæmons mentioned by Heſiod, cloathed with aërial bodies, ἀερα ἑσσαμμενοι, as he expreſſes it*, and who, he ſays, were the guardians and benefactors of men; and others we may ſuppoſe with no bodies at all, but to be pure immaterial ſubſtances. If in this way the immenſe interval betwixt God and man was not filled up, there would be a great gap in the ſyſtem of the univerſe; and things would not be connected together, the higher with the lower, which muſt be the caſe in every perfect ſyſtem, ſuch as that of the univerſe certainly is; and ſo far as we can obſerve on the earth, every thing is connected with every thing, as I have elſewhere obſerved †; and the more we obſerve of the variety of nature, the more we ought to be convinced

* Heſiodi, *Opera et Dies.*

† Page 18. and 19. of this volume.

ed of the truth of what Ariſtotle has told us, that every thing, which is poſſible to exiſt, that is, which does not imply a contradiction to the nature of things, does actually exiſt; for, otherwiſe, that poſſibility or capacity of exiſtence would be in vain. Now, the ſame author tells us, that as there is nothing deficient in the ſyſtem of the univerſe, ſo there is nothing ſuperfluous.

Moreover, I am of opinion, that it was agreeable to the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, that Man ſhould, in the firſt ages after his fall, have the aſſiſtance of ſuch beings as the Egyptian Daemon-Kings were, in order to enable him to recover in ſome degree from his fallen ſtate even in this life. And, accordingly, I am convinced, that all the arts and ſciences invented in Egypt derive their origin from thoſe Dæmon-Kings, ſome of whom are mentioned as the inventors of certain arts; ſuch as Iſis and Oſiris, of agriculture, and Theuth, or the Hermes of the Greeks and the Mercury of the Latins, of the art of language, as I ſhall afterwards obſerve. Nor was it in Egypt only that Providence interpoſed in this extraordinary way for the good of man. It is preſerved in the traditions of the Chineſe, that while they were in the ſavage ſtate, a man appeared among them, whom they called *the Son of Heaven:* And, in their religious proceſſions, they ſhow the figures of twenty-four men, whom they call *immortals.* Now theſe with the Son of Heaven, as they called him, we may, I think, with great probability, ſuppoſe to have been Dæmons, who, like thoſe in Egypt, civiliſed the people, and gave them laws; and for that reaſon are remembered, and have thoſe honours done them. Manco Capuc, the firſt Inka of Peru, and his ſiſter-wife, have a very great reſemblance to the Oſiris and Iſis of the Egyptians: So great, that I have not the leaſt doubt of their being ſuch Dæmons as the Egyptian; for I think it is impoſſible to account, how ſuch a man or woman ſhould have appeared in Peru at ſo early a period as the eighth or ninth century, and introduced ci-

vility and arts among the ſavages there. They could not, I think, have come from any part of North or South America, which we muſt ſuppoſe to have been then much more barbarous than it is now. And it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe that they ſhould have croſſed the Atlantic, and have come from Europe. I am, therefore, of opinion, as I have ſaid, that they were genii or Dæmons, ſent down from heaven to civiliſe thoſe barbarians, and thus far enable them to recover from their fallen ſtate.

Nor, I think, is the teſtimony of our ſcripture wanting to ſupport my opinion: We read there of angels, and likewiſe of archangels, who certainly were an order of beings ſuperior to the angels. We may therefore, I think, ſuppoſe them to be altogether immaterial beings: Whereas the angels may have been Dæmons that were embodied. That this was the caſe of thoſe angels, who came to viſit Abraham, is evident; for they not only had the bodies of men, but ate and drank with Abraham *. And that angels had a ſuperintendency and direction of human affairs, Plato and Heſiod ſuppoſe. With them too our ſcripture agrees; for we read, in the Revelation, of the angels of different churches: And in Daniels viſion, he ſays, he ſaw the angel of the Kingdom of Perſia, whom he calls the Prince of Perſia, but plainly diſtinguiſhes him from the Kings of Perſia, and the other Kings whom he mentions in that viſion †; and alſo the Prince of the Greeks, whom I underſtand likewiſe to be the angel of the Greeks ‡. And he alſo mentions the angel Michael, as *the great Prince which ſtandeth for the children of thy people*, that is, for the children of Iſrael §. And there is a very remarkable paſſage in Deuteronomy ‖, which ſays, *When the moſt high divided the nations, and*

* Geneſis, chap. 18.

† Daniel, chap. 11. v. 2. and following.

‡ Ibid. chap. 10. v. 13. & 20.

§ Ibid. chap. 12. v. 1.

‖ Deut. chap. 33. v. 8.

*and ſcattered the ſons of Adam, he ſet bounds to the nations according to the number of the Angels of God**. And for this Moſes deſires the people of Iſrael *to enquire at their fathers and their elders, and they will tell them ſo*†. So that it appears to have been a conſtant tradition among the Iſraelites from the earlieſt times. It therefore appears, that every nation had its guardian angel; and I think we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that theſe angels, being in rank inferior to the archangels, were Dæmons, though perhaps ſuperior to the Egyptian Dæmons, having bodies of a finer texture; and, if not immortal, living longer than the Egyptian Dæmons did, though theſe lived very long, ſome of them of the firſt race, it is ſaid, 2000 years, as I remember.

But if there were any doubt of there having been in antient times Dæmons, on the earth, of the human form, there is a paſſage in the ſixth chapter of Geneſis, which, in my apprehenſion, puts the matter out of all doubt. It is in the 2d verſe, where it ſays, *That the ſons of God ſaw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they choſe.* And in the 4th verſe we have theſe words: *There were giants in the earth in thoſe days: And alſo after that, when the ſons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them; the ſame became mighty men, which*

 were,

* The words of the text are, ὁτε διεμεριζεν ὁ ὑψιστος εθνη, ὡς διεσπειρεν υιους Αδαμ, εστησεν ὁριᾳ εθνῶν κατ' αριθμον ἀγγελων Θεου: Which are thus tranſlated in our Bible, *When the moſt high divided to the nations their inheritance, when he ſeparated the ſons of Adam, he ſet the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Iſrael.* This is one of the moſt blundering tranſlations in our Bible; for it gives a meaning to the paſſage quite different from the true one; which undoubtedly is, that God divided the nations according to the number of the angels, aſſigning to each a nation as his particular province. I have elſewhere obſerved (Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 84.) another blundering tranſlation of a paſſage in Exodus, (chap. 3.) where our tranſlators make nonſenſe of a very ſublime Theological truth.

† Verſe 7.

were, of old, men of renown. And the paſſage is rightly tranſlated according to the Septuagint, and alſo according to the Hebrew, if we can truſt to the tranſlation by Calmet, publiſhed at Venice in 1754. Now theſe *ſons of God*, as they are called, who copulated with the daughters of men, muſt have been Dæmons, that is an order of beings above men, but embodied as men are; and if ſo, it was very natural that the children ſhould be much ſuperior to other men, and ſuch as the Greek *heroes*, or ἡμιθεων γενος ἀνδρων, as Homer calls them; being a mixture of women with a ſuperior race of beings.

From the commentary of the tranſlator above mentioned, it is evident that this was the opinion of the elder fathers of the church, ſuch as Lactantius, Origen, Juſtin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian and Ambroſius. At the ſame time he informs us, that the later fathers were of opinion, that, by the *ſons of God* here, were meant the children of Seth, and that the daughters of men were the children of Cain. And the reaſon they gave for their opinion was, that theſe *ſons of God* were angels, or ſpirits entirely ſeparated from body, ſo that they could not mix with women. But this is plainly begging the queſtion; and ſuppoſing that they were not *Dæmons*, that is ſpirits embodied, but pure immaterial ſubſtances. Neither, do I think, can any good reaſon be given, nor indeed any reaſon at all, why the daughters of Cain ſhould have been ſo much handſomer than the daughters of Seth; ſo that the ſons of Seth ſhould have fallen in love with them rather than with the daughters of their own family and tribe.

And thus, I think, it is proved that Dæmons, ſuch as the Egyptian, exiſted in other nations, in very antient times.

As theſe Dæmons had been Kings of the country, and had introduced civility and invented arts, it was very natural that they ſhould be

be the objects of the popular worſhip. At the ſame time, I think it is evident, that the learned among the Egyptians, I mean the Prieſts, diſtinguiſhed betwixt the religion of the people and the religion of philoſophers: For I think it is certain, that the Prieſts not only believed in the exiſtence of one ſupreme being, but they knew how all things proceed from him, and in what order; firſt, the principle of *intelligence*, by which all things were made; and, ſecondly, the principle of *life* and *animation*, without which the whole creation would have been a lifeleſs maſs: In ſhort, they knew the myſtery of the Trinity, which I hold to be a truth of Philoſophy, and of the higheſt part of philoſophy, theology, as well as of revelation; a truth, which was diſcovered by ſuch philoſophers as the Egyptian Prieſts, but could not have been known to the apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians, without revelation. This Theology Plato brought with him from Egypt; for that Plato knew this myſtery of the Trinity, but kept it a myſtery, εν απορρητοις, as he expreſſed it, there is no doubt*; and for that reaſon, his Theology is ſaid, by the fathers of the church, to agree ſo much with the Chriſtian †. Now he could have learned this Theology no where elſe but in Egypt. He certainly could not learn it in Greece, as among the Greek philoſophers before his time, and even after his time, down to the time when Alexandria became the ſeat of philoſophy, there is not the leaſt hint given of it. And as to the notion, of Plato having learned it from ſome Jews that he met with in Egypt or elſewhere, in the firſt place, there is no evidence that Plato or any other Greek philoſopher went among the Jews to learn philoſophy; and ſecondly, if he had gone to Jeruſalem to converſe with the Jews there, he could not have learned it from them, as it is certainly not revealed in the books of the Old Teſtament, nor was it known to Jew or Chriſtian till the coming of our Saviour.

As

* Vol. I. of Origin of Lang. p. 7. 2d edition, and vol. V. of the ſame work, p. 338.

† Vol. V. of Origin of Lang. p. 344. and 345.

As to the popular religion of Egypt, it was full of rites, and ceremonies, and of pomps, and proceſſions, which were wonderfully attended by the people: And Herodotus mentions one proceſſion to the city of Bouhaſtis, in honour of Diana, in which there were 700,000 men and women beſides children *; for it is by their ſenſes, and not by their underſtanding, that the vulgar muſt be captivated, and their attention fixed on any thing: So that temples and altars, pomps and proceſſions, and ceremonies of every kind, are neceſſary for the popular religion of every country. Accordingly there was of theſe a great deal in the Greek and Roman, as well as the Egyptian religion. The Jewiſh religion, beſides a great many rites and ceremonies, was a religion of more ſplendour and finery, than any of thoſe I have mentioned. Among them Solomon's temple exceeded any thing, of the kind, to be ſeen in the other countries I have named. Even when they were in the wilderneſs, they made a Tabernacle, an Ark, an Altar, and a Mercy Seat, of wonderful finery and ſumptuouſneſs. The Mercy Seat and the two Cherubims were of pure gold, the Ark was overlaid with gold, outſide and inſide †. The Altar was likewiſe overlaid with gold ‡. And not only were the materials ſo coſtly, but the art, with which they were wrought, we muſt ſuppoſe to have been perfect of the kind; for the artiſts were inſpired §: And there was a magnificence and a finery in the dreſs of the Jewiſh Prieſts, ſuch as is not to be found in any other antient nation, particularly in the dreſs of Aaron the high Prieſt, which, beſides gold, purple, ſcarlet, and fine linen, had, upon the breaſtplate, twelve precious ſtones of different kinds, in four rows.

Such grandeur and magnificence could not fail to excite the attention of a people, who were as much or more governed by their ſenſes,

* Lib. 2. chap. 60.

† Exodus, chap. 25.

‡ Ibid. chap. 30,

§ Ibid. chap. 31.

ſes, than any people we read of. Even after their miraculous deliverance from Egypt, by the plagues ſent by God among the Egyptians, and the dividing the Red Sea to give them a paſſage through it, I doubt whether they would have believed in God, if he had not conducted them through the Wilderneſs by a cloud in the day and a fire in the night; and if they had not, from the top of mount Sinai, not only ſeen him but heard him: So that he was perceived by two of their ſenſes. And when this intercourſe with divinity had ceaſed for a few days, (not more than 40), they deſired to have a corporeal God, whom they might worſhip: And this was the figure of Apis, whom they had ſeen ſo much adored in Egypt *. And it would ſeem that God thought it neceſſary, in order to confirm the faith of even Moſes, to ſhow himſelf to him under a bodily form †.—Even after they were ſettled in the land of Cannan, they had ſo many ſacrifices, religious rites, and ceremonies, that they ſtill kept up a communication with the divinity by their ſenſes. And as to the Egyptians, beſides ſacrifices and proceſſions, they had ſo many living ſymbols of divinity, with which they were daily converſant, and of which I ſhall preſently ſpeak, that they might be ſaid to live with their Gods. And they were ſo fond of that life, and ſo much occupied by it, that when they were debarred it, and their temples ſhut up and ſacrifices forbid, which was the caſe under Cheops, the King who built the pyramid, they reckoned themſelves miſerable ‡. It is true that they were employed by Cheops in building his pyramid, which to be ſure was a great labour. But they would have been ſtill more miſerable if they had had nothing to do; for they would not have known how to have ſpent the time, which they were in uſe to ſpend in their devotion.

Muſic was an eſſential part of the religion of the antient world: Nor indeed is there any thing perceived by our ſenſes, that affects the ſentiments

* Exodus, chap. 32.

† Ibid. chap. 33.

‡ Herodotus, lib. 2. chap. 124

ſentiments and diſpoſitions of our minds more. And particularly it may be ſo compoſed, as to inſpire devotion more perhaps than any thing elſe. And accordingly it was by their church muſic, chiefly, as I have elſewhere obſerved *, that the Jeſuits converted the barbarians of Paraguay. Nor was the Religion of Egypt wanting in this reſpect; for their proceſſions were accompained by muſic †, and Plato tells us, that they had ſeveral ſongs of Iſis, that were 10,000 years old. And they conſidered muſic as ſo eſſential, both to the religion and the good government of the country, that they would ſuffer no innovations to be made in it, nor any other muſic to be practiced but that which had deſcended to them from the age of their Gods ‡.

The Egyptians, beſides the intercourſe they had with their Gods, by ſacrifices, proceſſions, and many rites and ceremonies, had a more direct and immediate communication with them by the means of their oracles, which they conſulted, not only in their public affairs, but in matters of private concern, ſuch as diſputes between man and man. And the reſponſes of their oracles were not myſterious and ambiguous, as among the Greeks, but plain and direct, as far as I can collect from Herodotus. The Egyptians ſought to be informed of future events in no other way. But the Greeks, beſides their oracles, which, like many other things, they got from Egypt, (as is evident from the account, which Herodotus gives us, of their moſt antient oracle, that of Dodona §,) divined by the entrails of the beaſts they ſacrificed. As to the Romans, they had no oracle worth mentioning, and none that they conſulted in their public affairs. But they divined not only by the entrails of beaſts, but by the flights of birds, and even by the feeding of chickens, which they called ſacred, and kept for that purpoſe.

The

* Page 101. of this volume.

† Herodotus, Lib. 2. cap. 60.

‡ Plato De Legibus, lib. 2. p. 656. and 657. Edit. Serrani.

§ Herodotus, Lib. 2. cap. 52.—54. *et Sequen.*

The antient Chriſtians, and even the moſt learned among them, ſuch as Euſebius and Origin, believed that the antient oracles proceeded from Dæmons, and were not mere prieſtcraft and impoſture; but that they had ceaſed upon the coming of our Saviour*. That the Egyptian oracles were the predictions of Dæmons, to whom it was permitted to reveal future events, I have no doubt; and that they were given by the ſpirits of ſome of thoſe Dæmons, who had reigned over them. Of theſe Herodotus has given us a catalogue; they were Hercules, Apollo and Minerva, Diana, Mars, Jupiter and Latona†. But I make a diſtinction betwixt the oracles of the Egyptians and thoſe of the Greeks, as well as betwixt their Gods. The Gods of the Greeks were men, and born of men, as Herodotus has very plainly told us‡: For they were men who had either come from Crete, (originally I am perſuaded from Egypt), or were born in Greece, to whom the Greeks gave the names and titles of Egyptian Gods, and aſcribed to them the attributes and adventures of theſe Gods; whereas I think I have proved, that the Egyptian Gods were Dæmons, that is Beings ſuperior to men. And if that be admitted,

* See upon this ſubject a very pretty little work of Fontenelle, entitled, *Hiſtoire de Oracles.*

† Lib. 2. chap. 83.

‡ Lib. 1. cap. 131. The expreſſion he uſes is ἀνθρωποφυεῖς, an epithet he never applies to the Egyptian Gods, whom it is evident he thought to be Gods, or at leaſt beings very much above men: And accordingly he every where mentions them with reverence, and obſerves a religious ſilence with reſpect to their actions and ſufferings: Ταῦτα μοι ἐυστόμα ἐστω, is his common expreſſion upon that occaſion. It appears that he was deſirous to conceal even that they were mortal beings: And accordingly he does not mention the places where they were buried, though it is evident that he knew them. The Egyptians, he tells us, had what they called δικηλα, the name they gave to their *myſteries*, in which were repreſented the actions and ſufferings of their Gods. (Lib. 2. cap. 171.) In theſe I am perſuaded Herodotus was initiated, under the vow no doubt of ſecrecy, which made him obſerve that religious ſilence with reſpect to theſe Gods.

mitted, I think there can be little doubt, that the oracles, aſcribed to them, did truly proceed from them. But as the Greeks had no Gods, ſuch as thoſe of the Egyptians, neither had they any Dæmons, who uttered oracles to them. Their oracles, therefore, we cannot ſuppoſe to have proceeded from any ſupernatural power, but from mere men, ſome of them, I think, of very ſuperior underſtanding. Such was the oracle that was given to the Athenians, when they conſulted the Delphic God what they ſhould do, when they were attacked by that prodigious army of Perſians commanded by their King Xerxes. The advice they got was, *to truſt to their wooden walls*; given, like moſt of the oracles, in ambiguous terms; and which accordingly was miſunderſtood by ſome of the Athenians, who thought it applied to ſome wooden walls of their Citadel; but being rightly interpreted by Themiſtocles, to mean their *ſhips*, it ſaved Greece, and, I think, I may add, all the arts and ſciences that we have got from Greece, which I believe would have been loſt if Xerxes had then conquered that country. At the ſame time, I am of opinion, that there was a good deal of prieſtcraft and impoſture in thoſe Greek oracles, particularly in later times, many of which were detected about the time of our Saviour's coming, and which I believe was the true cauſe of their ceaſing at that time *. But with reſpect to the Egyptian oracles, there is not the leaſt evidence of any impoſture in them, though it may be true, that all their reſponſes might not be exactly true; for the Dæmons were not infallible: Nor does it appear, that thoſe, who had the direction and ſuperintendence of thoſe oracles, had any intereſt to falſify them, ſuch as the Prieſts of Delphi, and of other oracles in Greece, had, who were generally very well paid for their reſponſes.

With reſpect, therefore, to the Egyptian oracles, a material part of their religion, by which they were directed in the conduct of their public

* See Fontonelle's work before quoted.

public and private affairs, there was nothing impious or abſurd, nor any ground to ſuſpect fraud or impoſture.

The only other thing I ſhall mention, concerning the Egyptian religion, is what is peculiar to it, and not to be found I believe in the religion of any other nation, antient or modern; I mean their *ſacred animals*, that is animals conſecrated to certain divinities, maintained when alive with great care and attention and at conſiderable expence, and when dead buried with much pomp and ceremony in ſacred ground. This is thought by many to be ſuch an abſurd impiety, as to diſgrace both the religion and the ſenſe of the nation. But Plutarch has informed us *, that theſe animals were conſecrated as ſymbols or emblems of the attributes of the divinity; and he ſays, what I think is very true, that any thing of the animal life, or even of the vegetable, is a much better type of divinity than mere inanimate matter, ſuch as ſtatues of marble or braſs, by which the Greeks uſed to repreſent their Gods. But I think, and ſo does Plutarch, that it is moſt abſurd to ſuppoſe that the wiſe men of Egypt, or even the ſenſible among the vulgar, believed that theſe animals were real divinities. If that had been the caſe, our Bible would not have told us that *Moſes* was inſtructed in all *the wiſdom of the Egyptians*. By the means of theſe animals, the Egyptians may be ſaid to have lived more with their Gods, than any other nation that we hear of, having, before their eyes, ſymbols of their divinities, not only in animals, which they could ſee but rarely, ſuch as that ſacred bird the *Ibis*, who deſtroyed ſerpents, and was therefore thought a very fit emblem of divinity, but common animals, ſuch as dogs and cats.

And thus, I think, is proved the truth of what Herodotus ſays, that the Egyptians were the moſt religious of all people. And if it be true, as I think it certainly is, that the people muſt be governed

* De Iſide et Oſiride.

not by their reaſon, but by their ſenſes, it is neceſſary, that, in the popular religion of every country, there ſhould be a great deal of pomp and ſhow, rites and ceremonies, ſuch as we have ſeen there were in the Jewiſh religion, and that of the other countries I have mentioned. Among the Egyptians, their ſacred animals were ſo many memorials of their Gods conſtantly before their eyes: So that there was among them more of *preſent deity* than in any other nation. It is therefore not to be wondered, that they were the moſt religious of all nations. And as no people can be happy or well governed without religion, they were for that reaſon the happieſt people, I believe, that ever exiſted, and the beſt governed, for the longeſt tract of time, of any nation that we hear of.

And here we may obſerve the difference betwixt the religion of the philoſopher, and that of the common man; the philoſopher, having cultivated and improved, by the ſtudy of ſcience and philoſophy, that *particle of divinity* which is in him, forms the ideas of immaterial ſubſtances, and of intelligence unembodied; and at laſt attains to the idea of a ſupreme intelligence governing this univerſe, and of numbers of other intelligences under him. And thus he may be ſaid to live in the world of ſpirits, being ſeparated from body as much as he can be in this life. While the vulgar mind, immerſed in body, is only converſant with objects material, knowing nothing of ſuperior intelligences, and not even of his own, never having ſtudied it. Far leſs can he know any thing of the ſupreme intelligence, unleſs by ſigns and ſymbols, rites and ceremonies, and other things perceived by his ſenſes. But even this *ſenſual* religion, as it may be called, if it be well conducted by the rulers of the ſtate, will make a great impreſſion upon him, and inſpire him with religious ſentiments, which muſt have a great effect upon his manners and conduct in this life, and will prepare him alſo for a better life in the next world. But a religion of *contemplation*, ſuch as that of the philoſopher, is not fit for an uninſtructed mind, being, in ſuch a mind, apt to run into fanaticiſm and wild enthuſiaſm.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Government, and the general Principles upon which it muſt be founded.—Of the importance of Government,—without it there could have been no arts or ſciences among men; nor of conſequence any Religion.—Even Religion without Government could not have made men happy.—Therefore Government a moſt important part of the hiſtory of man.—Men firſt lived in herds,—then in families.—Examples of men living in that way in antient times, and even at this day.—Of the Union of families, States were formed.—There Government became neceſſary.—Every State muſt conſiſt of the Governors and the Governed.—It is Nature that muſt fit men to govern or to be governed.—The Greek Philoſophers have ſaid too little of nature, *and ſeem to have ſuppoſed that* education *in the matter of Government was every thing:—Of the difference of men by nature,—ſome fit to govern, and ſome fit to be governed.—Of Heſiod's diviſion of men:—The firſt claſs of that diviſion only fit to be governors.—Theſe muſt be very few in every nation.—The excellency of the ſpecies,* Man, *confined to a few races, like that of other ſpecieſes.—The two other claſſes of men fit only to be governed, but in different ways.—No education can make men fit to govern, who by nature are not qualified.—How it was firſt diſcovered that men by nature were ſo qualified:—It was by the look, the figure, and the ſize.—In this way men were diſtinguiſhed in the herds;—and ſtill more in the ſocieties formed of families,—of theſe were the firſt founders of States and Rulers.—This proved by the example of the firſt States of Greece.—No States could have been conſtituted without ſuch men.—The deſcription of ſuch men by Homer.—*

Of

Of the heroic Kings in Greece.—Theſe not Dæmons, like the firſt Egyptian Kings, but mere men that came from Crete or Egypt.—Of the heroic form of Government,—of the qualifications neceſſary for the governor of ſuch a ſtate.—The ſame form of Government among the Indians of North America.—Obſervations upon the neceſſity of eloquence for carrying on a free Government.—The antient heroic Kings excelled in that art.—The account of thoſe Kings given by Homer, an important part in the hiſtory of man.—They were the nobleſt race of men that ever exiſted.—No exaggeration by Homer in their characters and manners;—all thoſe heroes of noble birth.—The value of horſes depends upon their birth.—No diſtinction betwixt men and horſes in that reſpect.—In later times, the diſtinction of birth obſerved, particularly among the Athenians and the Romans.—The bad conſequences of the neglect of that diſtinction, particularly among the Romans.—The ſame diſtinction of birth obſerved in modern times, particularly in the Knights of Malta.—No diſtinction of races of men now, as there was in the heroic times.—Of the degeneracy of the beſt races of men by impure mixtures, and by an improper education and manner of life.—Example of one heroic race being preſerved by living in a proper way.—The Government in Rome under the Kings, the ſame with the heroical Government.—Better under one King than two Conſuls.—Of the defect of the heroic Governments in giving ſo much power to the people.—The conſequence of that in Athens and in Rome.—Another objection to this heroical Government is, that it was not fitted for the improvement of arts and ſciences.—Theſe defects remedied in the Government of Egypt.

IN the preceding chapter I have ſpoken at great length of the Religion of the Egyptians. I am now to ſpeak of their Government; and I hope to be able to ſhow, that they were not only a moſt religious people, but the beſt governed, that we have ever heard of.

of. But, before I come to treat of their government in particular, I will ſay ſomething of government in general, and explain the principles upon which I think all good government muſt be founded.

It is government that conſtitutes civil ſociety, and makes man, of a ſolitary and gregarious animal, a *Political* animal; and ſo enables him to invent and cultivate ſciences, by which only he can in this life make any progreſs in recovering from his fallen eſtate. Without the uſe of arts and ſciences to a certain degree, I have ſhown both from reaſon and facts that men could not have had even the idea of a God, nor indeed of any intellectual being*: For it is only by the ſtudy of ourſelves, and of our own minds, of which men in the mere natural ſtate, or in the firſt ages of ſociety, have not the capacity, that we can know what intelligence is. But if we could ſuppoſe that men without arts or ſciences might be religious, even religion without government could not make men happy; for it is government that muſt guide and direct the exerciſes of religion, which, if not properly guided and directed, may produce, and often have produced, great miſchief in a nation. Government, therefore, is of abſolute neceſſity in the civiliſed life; and a good ſyſtem of government is the greateſt diſcovery of ſcience and philoſophy, as well as the moſt uſeful, that ever was made by man. And I think I ſhall be able to ſhow, that it was firſt diſcovered in Egypt. This I may be ſaid to have proved already, as I have ſhown that ſo many arts and ſciences were invented in Egypt, which could not have been without a regular form of polity, and one particularly calculated for the invention and cultivation of arts and ſciences. As government is a moſt important part of the hiſtory of man, I will here explain the nature of it, and give ſome account of the firſt governments among men, and of the progreſs of them from one ſtate to another.

That

* See Chap. VI. of this book.

That men, before they were civiliſed, lived in herds, and copulated promiſcuouſly like cattle, I think I have proved by facts both antient and modern, that can not be controverted *. And I think from reaſon and principles, ſetting aſide facts, it is evident that an animal, who had not yet the *uſe*, but only the *capacity*, of intellect, ſhould live in the natural way in which all animals live that are not beaſts of prey. But this life muſt have produced much diſorder among animals of ſo many paſſions and appetites as men. It was therefore very natural, that ſome ſhould ſeparate from the herd, taking with them one or more females and their children. And thus was conſtituted the family ſociety, in which I believe men lived for ſeveral ages before civil ſociety was conſtituted. In this way the families of Abraham and Lot lived in the plains of Aſia. In the ſame way Homer tells us, that the Cyclops lived in Sicily, every man, as he ſays, governing his own wife and children: And in the ſame way the people of Chili live at this day †; and likewiſe a people at a very great diſtance from them, the Samoeids ‡.

That detached families ſhould, for the purpoſe of carrying on any joint work, and of providing for the neceſſaries of life, or from ſome other motive of convenience, unite together and form a little ſtate, muſt I think in proceſs of time neceſſarily have happened; and, as Charlevoix tells us, did actually happen in North America, where the firſt ſtates, he ſays, were formed by the Union of three families. More families would naturally join the few that had firſt aſſociated, and for the ſame reaſons: And thus at laſt a great number of families would be aſſociated, which would make a regular polity, and form

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, Book 2. chap. 3.

† Freſier, in his account of South America.

‡ This fact I have learned from a book, of which I got the uſe from the King's Library in London, entitled, 'Memoire ſur les Samoeides et Lapons,' written by a Pruſſian, who was in exile for ſome years at Archangel.

form of government of abſolute neceſſity. And thus did Government firſt begin, of which I am now to explain the nature.

In all governments there muſt neceſſarily be two orders of men, the *governors* and the *governed*; which muſt be diſtinguiſhed from one another. And the firſt thing to be conſidered is, who are by nature fit to govern; and who on the other hand are only fit to be governed: I ſay *by nature*; for nature muſt take the lead in all the arts of life, and as much or more, I think, in the great art of government, than in any other. And I think the Greek philoſophers, in what they have written upon government, have ſaid much too little of nature, but ſo much of education, as one ſhould believe they thought that education alone could fit men to be good governors or good ſubjects. But though I hold it to be abſolutely neceſſary for both theſe purpoſes, nature muſt do her part, and lay the foundation, without which the beſt education can avail but little.

That men are different by nature, as well as by education, I think it is impoſſible to deny. We muſt therefore begin this inquiry, by conſidering the nature of *man*, and try to diſcover of what kind thoſe men are, that by nature are deſtined to govern or to be governed. And here an antient Greek poet, I mean Heſiod, has given us a diviſion of men, the beſt, I think, that ever was made with reſpect to government. Some men, ſays he, are capable of giving good advice; others, though they cannot give good advice, will take it: But there is a third kind, who neither can give good advice, nor will take it when given by others; and theſe, ſays he, are uſeleſs men *.

* Heſiod's words are,

Ὁυτος μεν παυαριστος, ὁς αυτος παντα νοησει
Φρασσαμενος τα κ' επειτα και ες τελος ησιν αμεινων.

Εσθλος

That there is a difference of natural parts among men, and that all men by nature are not fit for all things (for, *non omnia poſſumus omnes*, as the poet ſays,) is what I think undeniable. And it is equally certain, that of the firſt and ſuperior claſs of men, mentioned by Heſiod, the governors are by God and nature deſtined to be. Theſe muſt in all countries be very few in number; for it is with men as with other animals, the excellency of the ſpecies is confined to a few individuals, and their race. And if it were otherwiſe, man would be an exception to a rule, which we find to hold univerſally, among the animals that we are beſt acquainted with, and whoſe nature we have ſtudied, ſuch as horſes, oxen, and dogs. The ſecond claſs of men is more numerous; and theſe are the men who are capable of being governed as free men, that is, not by terror or compulſion, but by perſuaſion, being able to judge of what is right or wrong when it is ſet before them. But the third claſs is the moſt numerous of all in every nation; and they muſt be governed by fear and dread of puniſhment, that is like ſlaves; and as they are ſo numerous in every country, it is for this reaſon Ariſtotle has ſaid, that a great part of mankind are by nature doomed to be ſlaves; and that, therefore, there is nothing contrary to nature in the ſtate of ſlavery*: And I will add that there is many a man, who could hardly have a worſe maſter than himſelf. Thus it appears, that Heſiod's way of claſſing men, not only points out to us thoſe who are fit to govern, but alſo thoſe

Εσθλος δ' αυ κακεινος ὁς ευ ειποντι πιθηται.
Ὁς δε κε μητ αυτος νοεῃ μητ' αλλου ακουων
Εν θυμῳ βαλληται, ὁδ' αυτ' αχρηιος ανηρ.

Opera et Dies. v. 293. *et ſequen.*

Homer very well deſcribes the men of the firſt claſs, by ſaying that they ſee τα πρόσω και οπισσω. Of ſuch men the head of Janus with two faces, the one looking *before* and the other *behind*, is a very good emblem.

* *De Republica*, Lib. 1. Cap. 5. and following.

thoſe who are fit to be governed as free men, that is, by perſuaſion, and alſo thoſe who muſt be governed as ſlaves.

There is another thing to be obſerved concerning the nature of man, which, I am perſuaded, Heſiod knew, though he has not told it; that the qualities of mind as well as of body deſcend to the race. And in this reſpect, too, man reſembles other animals, and particularly the horſe, whoſe blood is known by his ſpirit, as well as by his figure, ſhape, and movements.

Thus I think it is evident, that nature has laid the foundation of excellence in the great art of government, as well as in other arts; and that no education can make a man fit to govern, who is not by God and nature deſtined for that office: And it only remains to be inquired, how we are to diſcover this deſtination. That men by governing, will ſhow themſelves fit to govern, there is no doubt. But the queſtion is, by what marks they were firſt diſtinguiſhed, and allowed to govern. And I ſay that the character of a governing man is as eaſily to be diſcerned in the features of a man, his look, his voice, and the movements of his body, as blood is in a horſe, by his look and movements: Nor do I think that there is any deſignation of character ſo marked in us, as that of a governing man. Theſe marks that I have mentioned, joined with a ſuperior ſize and figure, make what Euripides calls the *'ειδος 'αξιον τυραννιδος*, or as Tacitus has very well tranſlated it, *forma principe viro digna.*

It was in this way, that, I am perſuaded, men were firſt diſtinguiſhed among herds of ſavages; for that men lived in herds before they were formed into civil ſocieties, and what may be called nations, is, as I have ſaid *, evident, both from fact and hiſtory, and from the reaſon of the thing: Now I ſay, that, among theſe herds, men who

* Page 176. of this Vol.

were by nature deſtined to govern, would be diſtinguiſhed by the marks above mentioned from the reſt of the herd, and followed and admired; and they would be much more ſo, when families joined together to form ſtates. And if, beſides their ſuperiority of figure, they diſtinguiſhed themſelves in fight and in council, and invented or carried to greater perfection ſome of the neceſſary arts of life, they would become chiefs and rulers, and form nations, to which they would give their names. And this I hold to have been the origin of the firſt governments among the Greeks, where ſuch men as Dorus, Æolus, Ion, and Hellen, formed the nations Dorians, Æolians, Ionians, and Hellens; and in like manner in Aſia Dardanus and Tros formed the ſtate of Troy, and gave their names to the people.

Without men ſo diſtinguiſhed by nature, I do not think that ſuch ſtates, as I have mentioned, could have been conſtituted in Greece, nor indeed in any other country; for it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe that ſavages, who had by nature no ſuperiority one above another, would aſſemble together, form a plan of polity, and chuſe kings or governors: I am perſuaded, therefore, that in every country, when polity firſt began, providence ſo ordered things, that men ſhould have the aſſiſtance either of Beings ſuperior to men, ſuch as the Dæmons in Egypt were, (which country, as it was intended to be the parent country of all arts and ſciences, appears to have been particularly favoured by heaven,) or of men much ſuperior to other men, and who were by God and nature deſtined to govern their fellow creatures. And this I hold to have been the origin of all nobility, and of the *Jure Divino* right of Kings. Of ſuch a King Homer has ſaid,

——Ὡ ἐδωκε Χρονου παις αγκυλομητεω
Σκηπτρον τ' ηδε θεμιστας, ἱνα σφισιν εμβασιλευῃ *.

And this leads me to ſpeak of thoſe heroic Kings of Greece, who fought at Troy, to whom Homer ſo properly applies theſe lines, and of

* Iliad. 2. v. 205.

of the form of polity in thoſe ſtates, which they governed. They pretended to be ſomething more than men,

——ἡμίθεων γένος ἀνδρῶν,

as Homer calls them, being the Sons, as they ſaid, of Gods. But the Gods of Greece, as I have obſerved elſewhere, were not even Dæmons, but mere mortal men, who came to Greece from Crete *, but originally, I am perſuaded, from Egypt, from which Greece got its arts, and a great part of its inhabitants. The Arcadians, who were the moſt antient people in Greece, and called themſelves προσελήνοι, that is *more antient than the moon*, were a colony from Egypt; and ſo were the Athenians the firſt people in Greece †. And Herodotus has told us, that the leaders of the Dorians, a moſt antient tribe in Greece, were all from Egypt: And one of them Hercules, of whom they made a God, was originally an Egyptian, as the ſame author tells us, both by the father and mother.

The governments in thoſe ſtates of Greece, where thoſe heroes ruled, were, I think, perfect models of what may be called a free government; for the kings there had for their council the elderly men of the ſtate, which was what they called the βουλη γερόντων. With them the Kings deliberated: And what was determined, was reported by the King to a general aſſembly of the people. So that it was no law till it had their approbation; and that was obtained by the King haranguing them: So that they were perſuaded before they acted. And for that reaſon it was neceſſary that the Kings ſhould excel not only in council and in fight, as Homer ſays, but in eloquence. And accordingly Phoenix taught Achilles.

——μυθων τε ῥητῆρ' ἐμεναι πρηκτῆρα τε ἔργων ‡

A

* Diod. Lib. 5. cap. 77.

† See what I have ſaid upon the ſubject of the Athenians and Arcadians, being Egyptian colonies, in Vol. I. of Orig. of Lang. 2d. edit. p. 636. and following. And in Vol. V. p. 101.

‡ Iliad. 9. v. 443.

A very compleat plan of education deſcribed in very few words. So that the Kings in theſe heroic governments, were not only by their birth ſuperior to other men, but by their education. This ſame heroic form of government is at this day the government among the Indians in North America; for they are governed by hereditary chiefs, and a council of their Sachems or elderly men. And what the chief and this council determine, is propoſed to a general aſſembly of the warriors for their approbation by the chief, who harangues them, and who, therefore, like the Greek heroic Kings, muſt excel in eloquence, as well as in council and in fight. And accordingly it is well known, that a chief can have no dignity or authority, if he cannot ſpeak.

And this ſhows the excellency of the art of eloquence, by which alone a free government can be carried on: For in private converſation men may be convinced by queſtion and anſwer; in the manner of the Socratic dialogue, the moſt inſtructive of all converſation; but converſation and public ſpeaking, are two things quite different; for, in the aſſembly of the people, the only method of perſuaſion is by haranguing, when the ears of the people muſt be filled and pleaſed, as well as their underſtandings informed; ſo that the ſound in eloquence muſt be ſtudied as well as the ſenſe. And of action, which is the principal quality of an orator, the chief part is the management of the voice; joined, however, to that, there muſt be the look and the geſture of the body; and a certain dignity in the whole appearance of the man. Oratory, therefore, requires not only great talents of mind, but advantages of perſon, ſuch as none other of the fine arts requires, ſo that it is the moſt eminent and moſt dignified of all arts, and I think is not improperly honoured by Cicero with the appellation of *Regina artium.* And I have no doubt but that thoſe antient heroic Kings, who were ſuperior men, both in mind and body, were very great orators, perhaps the greateſt

that

that ever exiſted; and, accordingly, Homer has put into their mouths, as I have elſewhere obſerved *, ſome of the fineſt ſpeeches that ever were made.

The account which Homer in his Iliad has given us of thoſe heroic governments, is a very important part of the hiſtory of man; For I do not think, that ever ſuch men exiſted ſo eminent in council and in fight, in eloquence, public ſpirit, private friendſhip and hoſpitality. Whatever liberties Homer may have taken with facts, and I think there can be no doubt that he has added and taken away circumſtances, and altered the order and arrangement of them, that he might give to his fable that unity and that *ideal beauty* without which no work of art can be perfect. But, as to the characters and manners, I have not the leaſt doubt, that he has given them truly and faithfully, and at the ſame time minutely and circumſtantially. He has deſcribed the Greek heroes, not only as very great but very amiable men. So that I do not wonder, that Horace, though he lived in what is commonly thought a very fine age, earneſtly wiſhes to have been born in that heroic age,

——————Hos utimam inter
Heroas natum tellus me prima tuliſſet †

There are, I know, who think that Homer has exaggerated much in this matter, and that, upon the whole, thoſe Greek heroes were men ſuch as we, or very little different. But if he had aſcribed the actions, he makes thoſe heroes perform, to men ſuch as we, I ſhould have thought the Iliad a mock heroic poem, like the *battle of frogs and mice.*

All thoſe heroes were, as I have ſaid, men of illuſtrious birth, though not Gods, nor even Dæmons, like the firſt Kings of Egypt. Nor is there any example, in thoſe antient times, of men who founded

* Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lan. Book 4. Chap. 1.

† Lib. 2. Sat. 2. v. 92.

founded ſtates or performed any great action, that were not deſcended of noble parents. Among us at this day, no horſe is eſteemed that is not of a good race; and no reaſon can be given why there ſhould not be *blood* in men as well as in horſes and other animals*; for if it were otherwiſe, it would be a ſingularity in our ſpecies, ſuch as cannot be preſumed. Homer geneologiſes his heroes as accurately as we do our horſes; or even as the Arabians do theirs, who record the geneologies of their noble horſes as carefully as we in Scotland record the rights to our lands; and ſome of theſe geneologies are carried back 2000 years: I ſay their *noble* horſes; for we are not to imagine that all the horſes of Arabia are of equal value: For there are there, as well as among us, vulgar horſes of no eſtimation. But not only in the heroic age was birth in ſuch eſtimation, but alſo in later times. Among the Athenians there were the ευπατριδαι, that is, men of noble families, who were highly reſpected till the government became quite democratical: and then almoſt all the offices of State, all of them as far as I remember, except that of General or Admiral, were diſpoſed of by lot among the people, without the leaſt regard to birth, education, or fortune. Among the Romans in the firſt ages of their ſtate, the men of birth made a diſtinct order or claſs of men quite different from the Plebeians or vulgar men; and they only diſcharged the great offices of ſtate. And their race was kept pure

* Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis:
Eſt in juvencis, eſt in equis patrum
Virtus; nec imbellem feroces
Progenerant aquilæ columbam.

Horat. Lib. 4. Od. 4.

By which it would ſeem, Horace thought that there was as great, or nearly as great, a difference betwixt races of the ſame ſpecies, as betwixt different ſpecieſes of animals of the ſame genus. To this authority from Horace, may be added the autbority of Ariſtotle, who has defined *nobility* to be αρετη του γενος: And indeed the very name given it in Greek of ευγενεια implies that. It is, therefore, evident that Ariſtotle, as well as Horace, thought that nobility was not a thing merely of *inſtitution*, as ſome people now-a-days believe it to be, but that it had a foundation in *nature*.

pure, and unmixed with the Plebeians: Betwixt whom and the Patricians, intermarriages were prohibited by the laws of the XII. Tables; and the repealing of that law, and admitting the Plebeians to the great offices of State, such as that of Consul or Dictator, was, in my opinion, one of the chief causes of the ruin of their State. The first Plebeian Consul was taken prisoner, he and his army, by the enemy; and another Plebeian Consul, Terentius Varro, lost the battle of *Cannæ*, which brought the Romans to the brink of ruin*.

In modern times, birth was also much respected, particularly in the military orders of knighthood, such as the order of Malta, into which no man at this day can be admitted, who cannot prove his noble descent for six generations on both sides. And the practice of any mean trade, or money making art, does even, in these days, degrade a man of the highest birth so much, that he cannot be a Knight of Malta, though ever so nobly born.

But I do not think that, in the degenerate state of man in modern times, there ever was such nobility, even among our Kings, as that of those antient heroic Kings, or of the Kings of Sparta in later times, who were descended of Hercules. They were truly *jure Divino* Kings, destined by God and nature to govern their fellow creatures, such as Homer has mentioned in the passage above quoted. But the best blood may be corrupted by impure mixtures, which must happen very frequently, in countries where money is so much valued as it is at present in all the nations of Europe†; or it may be debased by the education of the youth in vicious pleasures, or

* See upon this subject, Vol. V. of the Orig of Lang. p. 199. and following.

† There is an old Greek poet who says, that πλουτος μιξις γενος: Which shows that even in antient times those impure mixtures, for the sake of money, were known.

in ſloth and indolence, without theſe manly exerciſes, of emulation and contention, practiſed by the Greeks, which, as Ariſtotle has obſerved, give vigour to the mind as well as ſtrength to the body. It was ſuch an education under the diſcipline of Lycurgus, which preſerved ſo long that heroic race of Kings in Sparta, the laſt of whom died glorioufly in battle, as Diodorus Siculus informs us.

The form of government of Rome, under the Kings, was the ſame, or nearly the ſame, as the heroic government: For it was a government by a King and a Senate, or βουλὴ γερόντων, with the concurrence and approbation of the people, aſſembled, and perſuaded of the juſtice and expediency of the meaſure by the ſpeeches of the leading men: And I hold, that the government under one King was much better than the government under two Conſuls: For, however government may be divided in the ordinary management of affairs, and in times of peace and tranquillity, in all extraordinary emergencies, when the ſafety of the ſtate is in danger, recourſe muſt be had to the government of one man; which undoubtedly is the beſt of all governments, when that man is what he ought to be. And accordingly the Roman commonwealth was not nine years old, before they were obliged to have recourſe to a Dictator*.

The heroic government, with all the advantages it had, was liable to one defect, in common with all government in which the people have any ſhare. And that was faction and oppoſition to the government of the beſt men. This evil is very little felt while the people continue virtuous. But, when they become degenerate and corrupt, it produces a great deal of miſchief. Even as early as the time of the Trojan war, while the Greeks were yet a virtuous people, there was a Demagogue among them, called Therſites, whoſe delight it was to rail at the ruling men, ſuch as Agamemnon and Ulyſſes, from envy no doubt of their ſuperior merit, and becauſe he thought, and

* Eutrop. Lib. 1. Cap. 12.

and I am perſuaded he was not miſtaken, that he was deſpiſed by them. This Demagogue was treated by Ulyſſes, as he deſerved to be; that is he was beaten by him; and there are many Demagogues, in modern times, who deſerve to be no better uſed. But in latter times, when the people were corrupted by wealth and luxury, the number of them increaſed prodigiouſly. And when the people came to have the whole power of the ſtate in their hands, which was the caſe of Athens in later times, thoſe Demagogues flattered the people, and made them do ſome as bad things as ever tyrants were perſuaded to do by their courtiers. And in Rome, when the government there became democratical, the ſtate was rent to pieces by factions, proſcriptions, and civil wars, and at laſt ended, as Democracies commonly do, in a moſt violent tyranny.

But another very capital defect in theſe heroic governments, was, that no arts or ſciences of any value could be invented or cultivated in them. So that however good the government might be, while the people remained virtuous, it was only fit for a people practiſing arms and agriculture, and other neceſſary arts of life, which was the caſe of the people of Greece at the time of the Trojan war, and of the Romans in the early ages of their ſtate. But the chief end of the political life, is to improve the human intellect by arts and ſciences, and ſo carry men on in that progreſs, which by God and nature they are deſtined to go through, in order to recover that ſtate of bleſs from which they had fallen.

That theſe defects were remedied in the Egyptian government, I will ſhow in the ſequel. But, before I come to ſpeak of that government, I think it will be proper to make ſome obſervations more upon government in general; for as it is by government that man is made a political animal, and ſo is enabled to go on in that progreſs, which God and nature have deſtined he ſhould make in this life, it is a matter of the greateſt importance in the hiſtory of man.

CHAP. IX.

The queſtion to be conſidered is, which is the beſt form of government among men.—That the democratical is the worſt, the author ſuppoſes in the preceding chapter.—That it is ſo, proved a priori, *from the nature of man and of government:—Proved alſo by fact and experience,—particularly by the example of the Athenians, a people, the cleverest that perhaps ever exiſted; yet they could not govern themſelves.—When they ceaſed to be governed by the laws which Solon gave them, or by eminent men, that got the lead among them, their affairs went into the greateſt diſorder, and their State was ruined.—Their ſeizing the public money, and applying it to their maintainance and pleaſures, one of the chief cauſes of their ruin.—This made them live an indolent and pleaſurable life, which made them unfit for the great wars, wherein they engaged—of their loſſes in the Peloponeſian war,—which had like to have ended in the total deſtruction of their city.—By the peace which they were forced to make, they were ſubjected to thirty tyrants.—One chief reaſon of their ill ſucceſs in the war, was their ſuſpicion of all the men of eminence among them,—which made them practice that extraordinary form of proceſs called Oſtraciſm.—Example of that in the caſe of Ariſtides.—They might perhaps have taken Syracuſe, if they had not recalled Alcibiades from that expedition.—Their reaſon for recalling him, a moſt frivolous one.—The adminiſtration of their affairs at Rome in ſome inſtances accompanied with the greateſt injuſtice,—an example of this in the condemnation and execution of fourteen of their ſea commanders, who had obtained for them a ſignal victory.—Their democratical form of government corrupted their*

their manners,—and made them a people quite different from their anceſtors.—Their government a moſt compleat democracy, where Liberty and Equality *were in the higheſt perfection.—No other example neceſſary to prove how bad a government democracy is, than the example of France before our eyes;—more folly, madneſs, and crimes, committed under that government by the French, than there is any example of in any other nation in the ſame ſhort ſpace of time. —Monarchy the beſt form of government.—It is the government of the Univerſe, and the firſt government among men—ſo much founded in nature, that it takes place occaſionally even in conſtitutions of which it is no part,—as in the caſe of the Dictator among the Romans.—Of the perpetual Dictator in Rome, and then of their Emperors.—One eſſential difference betwixt the democratical and monarchical governments, that the democratical never can be a good government, but the monarchical, though not reſtrained by laws, may be a good government;—two chances for that, if the King be a good King, or his Miniſter a good Miniſter—The particular happineſs of Britain is to have both good.—Nothing can make men deſirous of a change of ſuch a government, but the infection of the French madneſs;—proper means uſed to prevent that.*

THE chief thing to be conſidered in government is, which of all the various forms of it that have been uſed by men, is the beſt. From what I have ſaid in the preceding chapter, the reader will ſuppoſe that I think the democratical form is the worſt: And indeed I am ſo much of that opinion, that I hold it to be impoſſible, by the nature of things, that a democracy ſhould be a good government, or even that it ſhould not be the worſt that has been uſed by men. That there have been *virtuous people*, and that a good government, and good inſtitutions with proper education may make them ſo, there is no reaſon to doubt. But that there ſhould be a

wiſe

wiſe people, is by the nature of things impoſſible, unleſs we are to reject that diviſion of men made by Heſiod, and maintain that all men are fit to give good council, or at leaſt to take it when given by others. I, therefore, hold that what government is carried on by the whole people, without diſtinction of birth, rank, education, or fortune, whether it be carried on by every individual in perſon, or by deputies or delegates choſen by them, is of neceſſity a bad government, and the worſt of all governments, in which their can be neither virtue nor wiſdom. A propoſition which is not only ſupported by theory, but by facts, and the experience of all ages.

The Athenians were certainly a moſt ingenious people: Nor do I believe that there ever exiſted a people more acute, and of better natural parts, and theſe too improved by the culture of arts and ſciences. They were alſo a noble, high minded people: Nor was there ever a nation which acted ſo generous, and ſo diſintereſted a part as they did, when Xerxes invaded Greece with the greateſt force, both by ſea and land, that, I believe, was ever collected together: By which they not only ſaved Greece, but all thoſe arts and ſciences which we have got from the Greeks, and which are all that we now have *. But even they could not govern themſelves. While they were contented with the conſtitution which Solon had given them, who had been in Egypt, and had no doubt ſtudied government there, as well as other arts and ſciences, they went on well enough; though the government he gave them, he ſaid, was not the beſt he could have given them, but the beſt they would receive. And even after they had made their government quite popular, while their councils were directed by a Themiſtocles, a Pericles, or an Alcibiades, their affairs were proſperous, and they were the leading people in Greece. But when their counſellors were

* See what I have further ſaid, at conſiderable length, in praiſe of the Athenians. Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lang. Book V. Chap. 2. p. 344. and following.

were Demagogues, who flattered them as much as ever King was flattered by his courtiers, aſking them frequently *what they would have, and what they ſhould do to pleaſe them**, their affairs went into the greateſt diſorder, and ended at laſt in the ruin of their ſtate.

One of the chief cauſes of their ruin, was their ſeizing upon the revenues of their ſtate, which, we are told, was greater than all the revenues of the other ſtates of Greece put together. And this money they laid out upon their living, and their pleaſures, particularly the pleaſure of their theatre: So that there was nothing left for defraying the public ſervice, except, *firſt*, the contributions of the richer citizens, called εἰσφοραι, a very unequal and arbitary aſſeſſment; and *ſecondly*, what they called λειτουργιαι, or public ſervices, which were alſo a burthen upon the richer ſort, ſuch as the fitting out of ſhips of war, which was a great part of the expence of their ſtate: And even the rich they made contribute to their pleaſures, by defraying the expence of the choruſes of their tragedy and comedy, which contribution they called χορηγια†.

By theſe means, the Athenians led an eaſy, indolent, and pleaſureable life; ſuch as made them very unfit for any great undertakings. But their vanity, flattered by their Demagogues, made them engage in the moſt dangerous enterpriſes, by which they ſuffered greater calamities, in a ſhorter time, than almoſt any people we read of. Of theſe Iſocrates, in his oration, *De Pace*, has given a catalogue‡ beginning with the loſs of 300 gallies in Egypt with all their crews, in a fooliſh expedition they undertook to that country, in order to ſupport the rebellion of the Egyptians againſt the

* Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lang. Book 5. Chap. 2. p. 366.

† See this explained at more length in Vol. VI. of the Orig. of Lang. p. 349. and following.

‡ Page 460. edit. Wolfii.

the King of Perſia. In ſuch another expedition to Cyprus, they loſt 150 gallies. They carried their arms even as far as the Euxine ſea, where they loſt, of themſelves and allies, 10,000 men; and, in the Helleſpont, Lyſander deſtroyed 200 of their gallies: But the moſt extraordinary inſtance of their folly and *madneſs*, as I think it ſhould rather be called, of this people, was their expedition againſt Sicily, which happened towards the end of the Peloponeſian war, a moſt dangerous war, which the Athenians carried on againſt the Lacedaemonians and all their allies in Peloponeſus, and which laſted 27 years. When they undertook this expedition to Sicily, the Lacedaemonians were in poſſeſſion of a conſiderable part of their country, and almoſt at the gates of their city. Yet, even in that ſituation, they thought of nothing leſs than the conqueſt of Sicily, for which purpoſe they fitted out a very great fleet and army, with which they inveſted Syracuſe, though they never had received the leaſt injury from the Syracuſans. But they were informed that they had a very fine territory round their city, which they propoſed to divide among their citizens. In this expedition they loſt no leſs than 300 ſhips of war and 40,000 men. And their loſs was ſo compleat, that there was not a ſingle man left to carry the news to Athens *.

After ſuch loſſes, it was no wonder that they concluded ſo ill the Peloponeſian war, which had like to have ended in the abſolute deſtruction of their city, and making a ſheep park of Attica. This, we are told, was under deliberation among the Spartans and their allies. But inſtead of that, they obliged them to ſubmit to the government of 30 tyrants, whom the Spartans named.

By ſuch a ſeries of bad conduct, under their democratical government, the people were reduced to want even the neceſſaries of life,

as

* Diod Lib. 13.

as Iſocrates tells us in the end of his *Areopagiticus*. He there ſays a thing, that I ſhould not have believed but upon the faith of a cotemporary author of ſuch reputation, that there were citizens then in Athens, who went about aſking charity from thoſe they met in the ſtreets, to the diſgrace, as he very properly adds, of the city. Till I read that, I did not believe that any antient ſtate was ever ſunk to ſuch a degree of miſery and infamy.

One reaſon, among others, of ſuch ill ſucceſs in their wars, was their jealouſy of all their men of eminence, and their ſuſpicion that they aſpired to the government of the ſtate, and to put an end to their democracy. And, accordingly, Xenophon, in the accounts that he has given of their polity, tells us, that they were the declared enemies of all men of great eminence among them. And they had a form of proceeding, moſt extraordinary, againſt ſuch men, which they called *Oſtraciſm*; whereby, without accuſation or trial, they baniſhed them for 10 years.

In this way, as Cornelius Nepos has informed us, they treated Miltiades, who had gained for them the famous battle of Marathon, where 10,000 Athenians defeated 100,000 Perſians; and which may be ſaid to have been the prelude to all the victories the Greeks afterwards obtained over the Perſians, who, till that time, were reckoned invincible; ſo that, even at the battle of Platææ, the Spartans dreaded them ſo much, that they yielded the poſt of honour to the Athenians, in order that *they* might encounter the Perſians. And yet this Miltiades they condemned to pay a fine, that he was not able to pay: And ſo the deliverer of Athens and of Greece died in a jail. And what aggravated their cruelty exceedingly was, that Miltiades had never ſhown the leaſt of the diſpoſition of a tyrant, but on the contrary, the greateſt humanity, courteſy, and affability, in his whole life and conduct. But, ſays our author,

Populus maluit cum innoxium plecti, quam ſe diutius eſſe in timore. His ſon Cimon, for the ſame debt, was kept in priſon; and could not have got out of it, if he had not ſold his ſiſter and wife, Elpinice, to a rich man, who was able to pay the debt: But ſhe was ſold with her own conſent; for ſhe had more generoſity than the people of Athens, and declared that ſhe would not ſuffer the ſon of Miltiades to die in jail, as his father had done. After he was in this manner releaſed, he obtained for the people the moſt ſignal victories, both by ſea and land. And, as they were then overburdened with their numbers, he led a colony of 10,000 of them into Thrace; and having defeated the Barbarians there, founded a great city, well known, in after times, by the name of Amphipolis. For all this he was rewarded, by the people, with the oſtraciſm, though, as Cornelius Nepos, from whom I have taken this account of him, informs us, he was a man of the moſt ſingular benevolence and liberality that perhaps ever exiſted, and at the ſame time lived in the moſt ſplendid, as well as the moſt hoſpitable, manner. This it is likely was one thing, among others, which provoked that malignant and invidious people againſt him.

In the ſame way they treated Themiſtocles, another ſaviour of Greece; and who perhaps was the greateſt man both in war and in peace, in council and in action, that they ever had. It was to his advice, to leave their city, and to betake themſelves to their ſhips, or wooden walls, as the Oracle called them, that they and all the Greeks owed their ſafety, when invaded by Xerxes.

In the ſame way they treated not only men of great abilities, but of the greateſt virtues, ſuch as Ariſtides, who had ſuch a reputation for integrity and juſtice in his dealings, that he was ſurnamed *the juſt*. But he too was oſtraciſed, for no other reaſon, than this ſurname; as one, who voted for his exile, told himſelf. 'I do not, (ſays he,

' he), know the man; but I think no man is entitled to be diſtinguiſh-
' ed by ſuch an epithet'. Their expedition againſt Syracuſe, mad as it was, might have ſucceeded, if they had continued Alcibiades in the command of the forces, which they ſent to Sicily; but, inſtead of that, they recalled him to stand trial for a crime, which I think it is impoſſible he could have been guilty of, that of diſfiguring, in one night, all the ſtatues of Mercuries, in Athens; many of which ſtatues were copied from Alcibiades himſelf, who was as eminent for the beauty of his perſon, as for the qualities of his mind. Such a crime, I think, was more likely to have been committed by ſome who envied and hated Alcibiades, but who endeavoured to perſuade the people that he was the author of it. I will mention only one other act of theirs, of the greateſt ingratitude, more violent and unjuſt, than any I have hitherto mentioned, or than I believe was ever committed by any tyrant. It was condemning to death by one vote, and executing, five of their naval commanders who had obtained for them a noble victory in the greateſt ſea fight that ever was between Greeks and Greeks; becauſe they had left unburied thoſe of the Athenians, who were loſt in that battle, and had periſhed in the ſea, when they were prevented by a violent ſtorm from recovering their bodies, and giving them burial. Upon this Diodorus Siculus has pronounced the cenſure, that I think it deſerved, treating the people as mad, who could inflict ſuch a puniſhment upon men who not only had committed no crime, but were worthy of the higheſt praiſe and greateſt honours. Diodorus ſays, that it was the Demagogues who incited them to this act of violence and injuſtice. But it would not have been in the power of the Demagogues to have done this, if they had not been poſſeſſed of that ſpirit of envy, jealouſy, and ſuſpicion, which made them the enemies of men, who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves ſo much by ſuch a ſignal victory.

In ſhort, their envy and jealouſy of men of ſuperior merit went ſo far at laſt, that theſe men could not live with them: And all their great men in later times, ſuch as Conon, Timotheus, and Iphicrates*, would not live in the city, but choſe rather to go into a kind of voluntary exile, excepting only Phocion, who lived with them indeed, but was put to death by them, without ſo much as being heard in his defence.

From what has been ſaid, I think it is evident, that a democratical government is not only in itſelf a very bad government, in my opinion the worſt government of any, but that it has an immediate and direct tendency to corrupt the manners of the people ſo governed. The people of Athens, till their government became altogether democratical, were a magnanimous, noble minded people, as eminent in virtue as they were in arms and arts: But, how much they were degenerated from their anceſtors, when they undertook to govern themſelves, Demoſthenes, in more than one oration, has informed us*; and, indeed, the government was ſuch, that it muſt have corrupted the beſt people in the world: For every citizen of Athens, without diſtinction of birth, rank, education, or fortune, was entitled not only to a vote in the public aſſemblies, but to hold any office of ſtate, even the office of ſenator, and to be one of the council of 500, (which was reckoned the great pillar of their ſtate,) and to hold every other office, with the exception only of the offices of general or admiral, who were elected by the people; but even in their election he had a vote. But as to all the other offices, they were diſtributed among the whole people by lot. So that in Athens, there

* Upon this occaſion Cornelius Nepos makes an excellent obſervation: 'Eſt hoc 'commune vitium in magnis liberiſque civitatibus, ut invidia gloriae comes ſit, et libenter de his detrahant quos eminere videant altius; neque animo aequo pauperes 'alienam opulentium intuentur fortunam'.—*In vita* Chabriae.

† See Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lang. p. 367. and following.

there was the moſt perfect *Liberty* and *Equality;* two things, of which we have heard ſo much of late.

I think no other evidence is neceſſary to prove from fact and experience, as well as from theory, that the democratical form of government is the worſt of all. It is a form which naturally puts an end to itſelf without any external violence: Nor is there any example in the hiſtory of man, of that form of government laſting for any conſiderable time. But we need not go back to ancient hiſtory, to ſeek for examples of the pernicious conſequences of ſuch a government; we have an example of it at preſent before our eyes, ſufficient to convince every man of common ſenſe and obſervation, that it is productive not only of the greateſt folly and madneſs, but of the greateſt crimes. The republic of France has not yet laſted a year, now while I am writing; and in that ſhort time, it has produced more diſorders, more folly, and madneſs, and alſo more crimes, than ever happened in any nation ſince the beginning of the world, in the ſame ſhort ſpace of time; the conſequence of which has been the forming an union againſt them, of more nations in Europe, than ever were united againſt one nation. To deliberate how they are to defend themſelves againſt theſe combined powers, they meet in an aſſembly, which they call the *national convention;* where, beſides the conduct of the war, they have before them that moſt important buſineſs, the forming a conſtitution, and regulating the internal government of the country. But things are there conducted with ſo much diſorder, noiſe, and tumult, and what may often be called *mobbing*, that there neither is, nor I believe ever was, an example of the like in any aſſembly met to deliberate on public buſineſs. This alone convinces me, that they are utterly incapable of carrying on any kind of government even in the moſt quiet times.

Having

Having thus ſhown what is the worſt kind of government, the next thing to be conſidered is, which is the beſt. And I have as little doubt upon that point as upon the other; for I ſay that *monarchy* is the beſt form. It is the government of the univerſe, and it was the firſt government upon earth; for there is nothing more certain, than what the Roman hiſtorian, Sallust, tells us, that, *in terris id primum nomen imperii fuit* *. And Polybius has told us the ſame thing in his ſixth book, where he has given the ſame account, that I have given, of the origin of the firſt government of Kings among men; and with both theſe authors Cicero, in his third book *De Legibus*, agrees. And as it was the firſt government among men, ſo it is the laſt; and that in which all governments have ſooner or later ended. The government of one man is ſo much founded in nature, that even in thoſe conſtitutions of which it was no part, it was uſed when the ſtate was thought to be in danger. The Roman Commonwealth was not, as I have ſaid †, nine years old before they had recourſe to it, and choſe a Deſpot under the name of a Dictator. This they did upon ſeveral particular occaſions; and at laſt, when their government was ſo much corrupted, that the Commonwealth was become *a mere name, a ſhadow without a ſubſtance*, which was the ſaying not only of Julius Caeſar, but of Cicero, they choſe a perpetual Dictator; and were ſo lucky as to pitch upon the beſt man among them for that office. But as a great deal of the republican ſpirit remained among them, they murdered him, wanting to reſtore the republican government. Of this the conſequence was no other than what might have been expected; for it ended in the total deſtruction of the Commonwealth, and the eſtabliſhment of the deſpotic government of the Emperors; which under the firſt of them was mild and gentle

* Bell. Catalinar. Cap. 2.

† Page 186. of this Volume.

tle enough, but under his ſucceſſors became a moſt violent tyranny, by ſome of them carried to an exceſs, of which there is hardly any other example in hiſtory. And in other ſtates, as in Athens, while the republic ſubſiſted, the people were only happy, as I have obſerved, when they reſigned themſelves to the government of one man.

I will conclude with obſerving one difference betwixt the monarchical and democratical government; and it is a moſt material one. The democratical government, I think I have ſhown, muſt be in all caſes a bad government: Whereas, the kingly government, if the King be a good man, though altogether unreſtrained by laws and what we call a *conſtitution*, may be a good government, and the people happy under it. This was the caſe of the Romans under ſome of their Emperors, ſuch as Veſpaſian, Titus, and Marcus Aurelius. Or if the King ſhould not be a good man himſelf, but have a good miniſter, ſtill the people might be happy under his government. But it is the ſingular happineſs of Great Britain at this time, that we have both a good King and a good Miniſter, under the controul, however, of the two Houſes of Parliament; to which, I am perſuaded, both ſubmit with great chearfulneſs; as I believe that there is not a man in the Iſland that is a greater friend to our conſtitution than they both are. Our government thus conſtituted, has been of late ſo adminiſtred, that, with the help of ſome other nations in Europe, whom we put in motion, we have delivered Europe from thoſe enemies of God and man, whoſe profeſſed deſign it was to put down regal government and the preſent conſtitution in every kingdom in Europe, and to introduce, in place of them, that *Ochlocracy*, (for it does not deſerve the name of *democracy*,) which prevails in their own country, and has joined to the moſt diſorderly government, impiety and contempt of all religion. By this means,

means, Britain makes the greateſt figure, that it ever made, in the affairs of Europe, and in the beſt cauſe. Under ſuch a government, and in ſuch a ſituation of our affairs, what ſhould make any Britiſh man diſſatisfied with our preſent government, and deſirous of a change not only of the miniſter, but of the conſtitution? Nothing that I can imagine except the contagion of the French madneſs: To prevent which, the wiſdom of our adminiſtration has uſed very proper means, and which I hope will be ſucceſsful.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of the government of Egypt.—That government very antient,—as antient as the days of Joſeph;—no other regular government then on earth, except in India:—But that government derived from Egypt.—All governments conſiſt of the governors and the governed.—Of the governors in Egypt—The government the remonarchical, which the Egyptians thought the beſt government.—The King in Egypt had only the executive power.—A higher claſs of men were his Counſellors.—To them were intruſted the religion of the country, and arts and ſciences.—The excellency of every man, in every art and ſcience, muſt depend upon his natural genius and his education,—of theſe two the firſt is principal.—Nature muſt lay the foundation of excelling in all arts.—Of the difference betwixt the philoſophy of the Egyptians and that of the Greek philoſophers, as to the natural diſtinction of men.—The Greek philoſophers thought that education alone was ſufficient to make a good governing man.—The Prieſts of Egypt were the governing men there.—The name which they gave themſelves:—They were kept quite diſtinct from the reſt of the people,—had the cuſtody of religion, and the care of arts and ſciences.—Theſe two neceſſarily connected.—Without having cultivated his intellectual faculties, no man can have a juſt idea of ſupreme intelligence.—The reaſon for this.—Further proofs that there is a natural difference of men.—A great diſtinction of men in India in antient times.—This is ſtill to be ſeen there.—This diſtinction of men every where to be found,—even in the new diſcovered World in the South Sea.—No doctrine more abſurd than that of the natural equality of men.—The moſt pernicious doctrine when

applied to government.—Other claſſes of men in Egypt, ſet apart and diſtinguiſhed from the reſt.—And firſt the military claſs.—Some obſervations upon that claſs.—They belong to the 2d order of men mentioned by Heſiod.—The other claſſes conſiſt of men who are neceſſary in every ſtate, being ſuch as provide the neceſſaries of life for the people.—Difference betwixt Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, as to the diviſion of them.—To make the diſtinction of men among the inferior claſſes, a matter of great difficulty.—It was the work of the Dæmon Kings in Egypt, who formed the polity of Egypt.—This polity formed before the expedition of Oſiris into India, —not the work of any of the human Kings.—Providence interpoſed to promote the progreſs of men towards their recovery from their fallen ſtate, by the improvement of their intellectual faculties. —This he did among the Jews, to whom he gave a law and conſtitution, by his Angels and by Moſes.—This he did alſo in Egypt, but not in ſo ſignal a manner, as among the Jews.—It was proper that a difference ſhould be made betwixt the two nations.—Of the education in Egypt.—There the beſt education poſſible; for it was domeſtic,—all arts and ſciences there hereditary, and continually increaſing from generation to generation.—This education compared with the education among us, and the education among the Greeks and Romans.—Nature and Education never ſeparated among the Egyptians.—Where that ſeparation is made, the characters of men can never be perfect.—Of the manner of living of the Egyptian Prieſts.—This too qualified them to excell in arts and ſciences.—In this likewiſe very different from men of ſcience in other countries.—It was therefore neceſſary, that they ſhould excell the Greeks and every other nation in arts and philoſophy.—The Egyptians had not among them the arts of poetry and rhetoric.—Nor did they cultivate muſic ſo much as the Greeks did, as it was no art of pleaſure among them.—Sculpture and painting practiſed among the Egyptians, but more cultivated among the Grecks.—The

Greek

Greek genius, particularly ſuited for the fine arts.—Of the election of the Kings in Egypt.—The Prieſts there were electors,—but had not ſo great power over the Kings, as the Prieſts of Ethiopia had, though the Egyptians were a colony of Ethiopians, and though there was a great ſimilarity of cuſtoms and manners in the two nations.—Of the diviſion of land in Egypt.

HAVING ſaid ſo much in the preceding chapter of government in general, and of the different governments of different nations, I come now to ſpeak of the government of Egypt.

That Egypt had very early a regular form of government, I think I have proved very clearly, as early as the days of Joſeph*. Nor does it appear, that there was in any other country, at that time, a regular form of polity except in India; but which, I ſhall ſhow very clearly in the ſequel, came from Egypt: And this being the caſe, it is evident, that this great and moſt uſeful art of government was invented in Egypt, as well as the other arts I have mentioned.

In every country, where there is a regular government, there muſt be, as I have obſerved, two orders of men very different from one another, the governors and the governed. I will begin with the governors of Egypt, the moſt illuſtrious order of the two, and who, if they are not men, ſuch as they ought to be, it is impoſſible that the country can be well governed. The form of the government in Egypt was monarchical, the beſt of all forms, as I think I have proved it to be: And that this was the opinion of the people of the country, who, as I have ſhown, were eſteemed the wiſeſt of all the antient nations, Herodotus tells us, when he ſays, that the

* Page 132. of this volume.

Egyptians would never be without a King*. This King was choſen out of the military claſs of men among the Egyptians. But he was intruſted only with the executive part of the government. And there was a higher claſs of men ſtill, who were his counſellors and who, at the ſame time, were truſted with the religion of the country, that moſt eſſential part of government: And to them alſo was intruſted the cultivation of arts and ſciences.

The excellency of every man in every art and ſcience depends upon two things, his natural genius, and his education. Of theſe two, I hold nature to be the firſt and fundamental quality: For if nature has not laid the foundation in every art, and particularly in the great art of government, no education or culture can make a man excel in it.

And here we may obſerve the difference betwixt the *wiſdom*, or the *philoſophy*, as the word ought to be tranſlated †, of the Egyptians, which Moſes learned, and the philoſophy of the Greeks: For the Greek philoſophers, ſuch as Plato and Ariſtotle, who write upon government, ſpeak ſo much of the education of the governors, and ſo little of their nature and genius, that one ſhould think they believed, that education alone was ſufficient to make a governing man. And Plato is ſo far from thinking that there was any difference of natures among men, or, if there was any, that it ought to be preſerved, that he makes it an eſſential part of his polity, that the wives and children of his citizens ſhould be common: So that every diſtinction betwixt the races of men muſt in his ſyſtem have been deſtroyed. In this, however, his ſcholar Ariſtotle differs from him, but

* Lib. 2. cap. 147. Ed. Weſſelingii.

† Acts of the Apoſtles chap. 7. v. 22. The Greek word is σοφια, which ſignifies *philoſophy*, not what we call *wiſdom*, that is prudence in the conduct of life.

but for other reaſons, not that of confounding the races of men*. The opinion of the Egyptians was very different; for they made nature principal and fundamental in the art of government, as well as in other arts. For this reaſon they ſet apart and diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the people, with whom they did not intermix by marriages, a race of men who were called by the Greeks *the Prieſts of Egypt*, becauſe they had the charge of that principal part of government,—*religion*. But their name in the country was, as Herodotus tells us, πυρωμις†, which, as he interpets it, ſignifies καλοςαγαθος, that is a man who has worth and goodneſs, and at the ſame time, a high ſenſe of what is beautiful and becoming in ſentiments and actions, without which no character can be perfect. Theſe men, thus deſtined by God and nature to govern by their councils their fellow creatures, being ſet apart from the reſt of the people, were the counſellors of the Kings, that is, they were the *wiſdom* of the nation. At the ſame time, they had the care of religion, without which

* De Republica. Lib. 2. in initio.—I am ſurpriſed that Ariſtotle, in this work upon government, ſhould give no preference to birth in the government of a ſtate, when he has ſaid, in his 7th Book *De Republica* cap. 13. that the goodneſs of men depends upon three things, *nature*, *cuſtom* or *habit*, and *reaſon*. Now, that the parents of whom men are produced, muſt have a great influence upon their nature, he has told us in ſo many words, where he ſays, that nobility is *the virtue of the race*. (Ibid. Lib. 3. Cap. 13.) And as I have obſerved (p. 184. of this volume) the word which the Greeks have for *Nobility*, viz. ευγενεια, implies that. Yet in the conſtitution of his beſt government, which he calls πολιτεια, he makes no diſtinction of men according to their birth, nor gives any pre-eminence to the virtue of the race: And in his long chapter upon marriage, (Lib. 8. Cap. 16.) he ſays nothing about preventing the mixture of the better races of men with the worſe.

† I think, it is not unlikely, that the name *Bramin*, which the Indians give to their Prieſts and philoſophers, may be a corruption of the word Πυρωμις: For by changing the π into another labial conſonant, viz. β, which is a change very common, the word becomes Βυρωμις, and by leaving out the vowel υ, which is alſo not uncommon in languages that paſs from one country to another, the word becomes Βρωμις. And La Croze, in his Hiſtory of the Chriſtianity of India, has informed us, that, in the Iſland of Ceylon, they are called by a name which comes ſtill nearer to the word Bramin.

which no people can be well governed or happy; and to their care were likewiſe committed arts and ſciences, without which, as I have obſerved in more than one place, it is impoſſible that man can make any conſiderable progreſs in this life towards recovering his former ſtate, as that can only be by the improvement of his intellectual faculty, which is of the eſſence of man, and without which he can have no juſt idea of ſupreme intelligence, nor conſequently be truly religious. For this I have given a very good reaſon, which is, that men in the uncivilized ſtate, or even in the firſt age of civility, cannot be philoſophers enough to know themſelves: For as man is made after the image of God, and is the only image of him upon this earth, it is by the ſtudy of himſelf only that a man can have any idea of the ſupreme being: And, therefore, I have ſaid, that nations in the rude ſtate of ſociety, which have got any idea of a God, muſt have got it from other nations, more advanced in civility and arts *.

In this manner was the beſt race of men in Egypt diſtinguiſhed and ſeparated from the reſt of the people. And here, though I have ſaid a good deal in the preceding chapter upon the natural difference of men, I will add ſomething more upon the ſubject. The moſt antient nation at preſent in the world, now that the Egyptian is no more, is the Indian. There, Ariſtotle tells us, upon the authority of an author he calls *Scylax*, that the Princes of India were as much ſuperior to the other men of the country, both in mind and body, as the Greeks ſuppoſed their Gods and heroes to have been to other men†: And I was informed by a man, who had been much in the inland parts of India, that at this day their Rajahs, or Princes, are handſomer, of larger ſize, and more dignified appearance, than the reſt of the people. And the Bramins, being the beſt race of men in India, as the Egyptian Prieſts were the beſt race there, are eaſily diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the

* Page 153. and following of this volume.

† De Republica. Lib. 7. Cap. 14.

the people by their look, their figure, and appearance. And I am perſuaded, that, in Britain, and in every other part of Europe, a man of rank and family was, ſome hundred years ago, as readily known at firſt ſight, as a horſe of blood is now. And this natural diſtinction of men, appears to be known in every country on earth: For in the New World, which Captain Cook has diſcovered in the South Sea, the ranks of men are as much diſtinguiſhed, by their ſize and figure, as ever they were at any time in Europe. Bouganville, the French traveller, ſays, that the Nobles in Ottaheite are ſo much diſtinguiſhed in that way from the Tootoos, or lower ſort of people, that he is inclined to believe them to be of a different nation. And Captain King, in the third volume of Captain Cook's laſt voyage*, ſpeaking of the *Erees*, or chiefs of the Sandwich Iſles, ſays, 'The ſame 'ſuperiority, that is obſervable in the perſons of *Erees* through all 'the other iſlands, is alſo found here. Thoſe, whom we ſaw, were, 'without exception, perfectly well formed; whereas, the lower 'ſort, beſides their general inferiority, are ſubject to all the variety 'of make and figure that is ſeen in the populace of other countries. 'Inſtances of deformity are more frequent here than in any of the 'other iſlands.' Then he proceeds to mention ſome particular inſtances of deformity among them. And Mr Matra, who accompanied Captain Cook in his firſt voyage, and whom I have elſewhere mentioned†, as one who had looked with a diſcerning eye upon men, and had ſtudied with particular attention manners and characters, aſſures me that the leading men in all the iſlands where he was, had ſomething in their appearance, their voice, and manner, which diſtinguiſhed them from the reſt of the people ſo much, that it was obſerved even by the common ſailors aboard the ſhip, who knew them immediately to

* Page 126.

† In Origin of Language, Vol. V. p. 213.; alſo in the introduction to Vol. VI. p. 4. Where the man I mention, who gave me an account of the eloquence of the New Zealanders, is the ſame Mr Matra, now our conſul at Morrocco.

to be governing men. Captain King, in the paſſage above quoted, informs us, that the lower ſort of people in the Sandwich iſlands, beſides their inferiority in ſize and ſhape, are liable to ſeveral diſeaſes from which the Erees are free. And, according to his account, they have no complaint but what is brought upon them by the uſe of that dreadful liquor, which unhappily they have diſcovered, and appears to be worſe than even our brandy. It is called *ava*. With reſpect to health, it may be obſerved, that what Captain King ſays of the greater health of the men of diſtinction in thoſe iſlands, is, I believe, true of men of birth every where, if they live as they ought to do; for I hold it to be one of the characteriſtics of the noble race among men, that they are healthier and longer lived, if they do not hurt themſelves by an improper way of living, than the reſt of the people. And this, I think, is the neceſſary conſequence of their natural ſuperiority in ſize and ſhape. The ſame I hold to be true of horſes of blood, who, according to my obſervation, when they are properly uſed, are healthier and longer lived than other horſes, and can even endure more ill uſage. In ſhort, I think that the *natural equality of men*, of which we have heard ſo much of late, is one of the moſt abſurd doctrines that ever was maintained, contrary both to the reaſon of the thing, to fact, and to the general ſenſe of mankind; and when applied to government, and made the foundation of the political ſyſtem, leads to the moſt pernicious conſequences; of which we have at preſent a moſt melancholy example before our eyes in France. If the philoſophers there, who, I am perſuaded, laid the foundation of all the miſchief that has happened in that country, had been truly philoſophers, as they call themſelves, or had been learned enough to know the hiſtory of man, they would have known, not only that *equality* was not eſſential to government, but that, on the contrary, all government was originally founded upon the *inequality of men*, by which ſome men were much ſuperior

rior to others, both in mind and body; without which it does not appear to me that any government on earth was ever formed or could have been formed.—But to return to the government of Egypt.

There not only the counſellors of ſtate, the cuſtodiers of religion, and the cultivators of arts and ſciences, were ſet apart and diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the people; but there were, in like manner, four other claſſes, profeſſing different arts, who did not mingle with one another, but kept their races pure and unmixed. The firſt of theſe four was the military claſs, who came very properly next in order after the counſellors of the ſtate, which, as it was governed by their councils, ſo it was protected and guarded by the arms of the military men. Theſe I hold to belong to the ſecond diviſion of men mentioned by Heſiod, who, though they cannot give good advice, are willing to take it; for obedience to the orders of his officer is eſſential to the character of a ſoldier. And he ought to be convinced, that what he is ordered to do by his officers, is the beſt thing he could do; for otherwiſe he will not obey willingly, but will be governed, like the third claſs of men mentioned by Heſiod, by fear and dread of puniſhment, in the manner that ſlaves are governed; but which is unworthy of the noble mind of a ſoldier. As to the General of an army, he ought to be, with reſpect to military operations, of the firſt claſs of men mentioned by Heſiod, who know what is beſt, and therefore can give good advice.

But the Egyptian legiſlators did not ſtop here. And, indeed, it was neceſſary that men ſhould be provided, who were to procure for the reſt of the people the neceſſaries and conveniences of life. For this purpoſe, too, they thought that ſome men were better qualified than others, as well as for government and the profeſſion of arms. And, in general, it appears, they believed not only that all

men were not fitted by nature for all things, but that every man was born more fitted for one thing than for another; which I am perſuaded is the caſe. There were, therefore, beſides the Prieſts and the ſoldiers, a third claſs of huſbandmen, a fourth of ſhepherds, and a fifth of handicraftſmen. This is the diviſion of the people of Egypt, which Diodorus Siculus has given us *.

And here a queſtion will naturally occur, By what means ſuch a diviſion of men was made, by which diſtinct and ſeparate claſſes of men were ſet apart for the different occupations of life? That the men deſtined by nature to govern their fellow creatures, might be diſcovered even among herds of men, by their look, their figure, and appearance, and by ſuperior qualities of mind as well as of body, I have ſhown elſewhere; and that in this way the Greek heroes, and founders of ſtates, became Kings and rulers. But how were a whole people divided and aſſigned to different occupations, for which they were by nature ſuited? A man, who by nature is deſtined

* Herodotus has made the number of claſſes greater, altogether ſeven; namely, Prieſts, Soldiers, Cattle herds, Swine herds, Merchants, Interpreters, and Pilots: (Lib. 2. Cap. 164.) As Herodotus was in the country much earlier than Diodorus, and when we muſt ſuppoſe that the antient conſtitution of Egypt was better preſerved than in later times, I ſhould be inclined to think, that his diviſion was more accurate than that of Diodorus. But I cannot account for Herodotus omitting the huſbandmen, or tillers of the ground; who are the moſt uſeful of all the inferior orders of men, and, therefore, are very properly ranked by Diodorus next the fighting men. Neither can I account for Herodotus omitting altogether thoſe who practiſed mechanic arts. If there were any doubt in this matter, I think it is removed by the practice of India, to which the diviſion of men, into different claſſes, or *caſts*, as the Indians call them, was brought by the Egyptians. Now the huſbandmen, or tillers of the ground, are there a caſt by themſelves; and the ſeveral mechanics form ſo many different caſts. And Diodorus Siculus tells us, that in India, in his time, the farmers were a very numerous claſs of people, and very much reſpected even by nations that were at war with one another: For it was a rule among them, not to do any hurt to the farmers or their poſſeſſions.—(Diodorus, Lib. 2. Cap. 41.)

deſtined to be a King or governing man, may be diſcovered by the εἰδος ἀξιον τυραννιδος of Euripides, or by the *forma principe viro digna*, of Tacitus: But how are we to diſcriminate the farmer from the ſhepherd or from the mechanic? And I ſay it was the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, that made this diſtinction of men, and eſtabliſhed a form of Polity altogether ſingular, and unknown in any other country of the world except India, to which it was carried by the Egyptians with their other arts. That this polity was eſtabliſhed in Egypt, before the expedition of Oſiris into India, I think, is evident: For we cannot believe, that he eſtabliſhed there a polity unknown in his own country, or that he could have fitted out ſuch an army, and carried it to ſo diſtant a part of the world, from a country that was not highly civilized, and had not a regular form of government. I hold, therefore, that as Oſiris was of the laſt of the three races of the Egyptian Dæmon Kings, the polity of Egypt was formed by the two firſt races, with ſome additions, perhaps, that Oſiris may have made to it: For that it was not formed under Menes, or any of the human Kings, is evident from all the antient authors, who ſpeak of Egypt. Some of theſe Kings, we are told, made ſome laws for the adminiſtration of juſtice; but no author has given the leaſt hint, that any of them framed a conſtitution of government for the country.

That the reſtoration of man to his primitive ſtate, which, I think, I have ſhown, could only be carried on in this life by the eſtabliſhment of civil ſociety, ſhould be the peculiar care of providence, no body can doubt, who believes that a wiſe and good God exiſts. And the moſt natural way that this event could be brought about, was by ſending among men ſuperior beings in the human form, who were to teach them arts, and eſtabliſh a political ſociety among them.

That in this way there was one people inſtructed from Heaven, our ſacred records aſſure us; I mean the Jews, who, after they came out of Egypt, were guided and directed in every thing by miniſters ſent from Heaven. Theſe appeared to Moſes in the human form, and even to the whole people, from the top of mount Sinai, in fire and ſmoke; and a voice was alſo heard from that mountain, proclaiming the law of the ten commandments. And they received alſo from Heaven a religion, and a form of polity, which was communicated to them by the ſame Moſes. The neceſſary arts of life they had learned in Egypt. But ſome of the fine arts, by which the tabernacle was adorned, we are told that they learned from Heaven; for it is ſaid, that God inſtructed the artificers of that tabernacle. Now, I believe, what St Paul tells us, *that God is not the God of the Jews only, but alſo of the Gentiles:* And, therefore, I think it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that he would ſend his miniſters to inſtruct the Egyptians as well as the Jews, eſpecially if it be true, as I think it is, that from Egypt arts and ſciences were to be propagated all over the earth. And we are told that even Moſes brought with him from Egypt the *wiſdom*, or, as it ſhould be called, the *philoſophy* of the Egyptians *. To ſuppoſe, therefore, that the Egyptians were inſtructed in the ſupernatural way I have mentioned, is not only agreeable to what philoſophy teaches us to believe was the ſyſtem of Providence for the reſtoration of man, but to our ſacred writings, which give us an example of a people being inſtructed in the ſame way, and by a more preſent deity than that which inſtructed the Egyptians. Nor is it to be wondered, that God ſhould interpoſe in a more conſpicuous manner in behalf of his choſen people the Jews, from whom was to come the Meſſiah, the Saviour of the world, by ſending his Angels to inſtruct them, not employing Dæmons as he did among the Egyptians. But theſe were ſufficient to give the Egyptians an admirable form of government,

* See p. 204. of this volume.

ment, and to inſtruct them in arts and ſciences, which, it appears to have been the will of heaven, ſhould be propagated all over the world from Egypt. So that we are not to wonder, that Providence interpoſed in behalf of Egypt by ſending Dæmons among them, not Angels, to govern them.

And thus, I think, I have ſhown, that, as far as nature could go, the Egyptian polity was the moſt perfect of any that ever exiſted. But as education is neceſſary both to make good governors and good ſubjects, I will next inquire concerning the education in Egypt: And I think I ſhall be able to ſhow, that, in this reſpect alſo, the Egyptian government was the beſt that ever exiſted. That the domeſtic education under a father is the beſt of all educations, if the father be a man who is able to inſtruct his child, cannot I think be doubted; for both the teacher will be more anxious to inſtruct his child, than we can ſuppoſe any other teacher will be, and the child will more readily receive inſtructions from the parent than from any other, and will get it too more conſtantly and frequently than he could do from any other teacher. Now, in this way, all the children of Egypt were educated; and all the ſeveral claſſes were inſtructed in their different arts and profeſſions. In this way their wiſe men and philoſophers were taught the ſeveral arts and ſciences, which therefore may be ſaid to have been hereditary among them, as our lands and money are among us. And, if ſo, I think it was neceſſary, that they ſhould go on increaſing from generation to generation. Now, let us compare this way of teaching arts and ſciences with our ſchool or college education, or even with the education among the Greeks and Romans, which, I think, in ſome reſpects was worſe than even our education; for among them they had no public ſchools, except for grammar, muſic, and athletic exerciſes. But, as to ſciences, and particularly as to philoſophy, which contains the principles of all arts and ſciences, there was no ſchool

by

by public authority in which they were taught. It is true, that there were men among the Greeks, who were great philoſophers, and were willing to communicate their diſcoveries to any who choſe to be their hearers. But they had no encouragement from the public, nor was any man obliged to be their ſcholar. So that it is true what Diodorus Siculus obſerves, that, in Greece, it was by accident if a man happened to get a taſte for philoſophy, that he applied to it. And, not only were the philoſophers in Egypt taught in the way I have deſcribed, but every art and profeſſion, even the meaneſt and moſt illiberal: So that I have no doubt, that even theſe arts in Egypt were carried to the greateſt perfection. There was one of them, which is reckoned a great curioſity among us, the hatching of chickens and other birds without the incubation of the female. This was practiſed in Egypt, and muſt have very much increaſed the breed of fowls.

Thus it appears, that nature in Egypt was always aſſiſted by education; and, indeed, they ought never to be ſeparated: Otherwiſe there will be nothing perfect in the characters of men. And it is the want of the union of theſe two, that is the great imperfection in all the governments we know, or have heard of, except the Egyptian, or Indian, which was derived from it. And this is one of the principal reaſons, among others, which makes me think the Egyptian polity not only the beſt that ever exiſted, but better than any of thoſe imaginary polities that have been deviſed by philoſophers, ſuch as thoſe of Plato and Ariſtotle.

Having ſaid ſo much of the education of the people of Egypt, it will be proper to add ſomething concerning their manner of living, and to inquire whether that was fit to make them excel in their ſeveral arts and profeſſions. And, firſt, as to their prieſts and philoſophers, they had every thing furniſhed to them, which they wanted,

wanted, by the public, out of that portion of the land which was ſet apart for religion. The philoſophers, therefore, of Egypt were freed from all care and ſolicitude about money, which, as it is well known, employs the thoughts of ſo many men at preſent in Europe, and indeed I may ſay of every man more or leſs: And which, of neceſſity, muſt divert the mind, in ſome degree at leaſt, even of the moſt ſtudious among us, from the cultivation of arts and ſciences. The diet of the Prieſts, as Herodotus has deſcribed it, was of the beſt kind; for they were allowed fleſh, and alſo drank wine: But, we know, they uſed both in great moderation. Then they had the enjoyment of leiſure, without which it is impoſſible that any man can excel in any art or ſcience; for there was no particular office of the ſtate which they diſcharged, other than that ſome of them attended upon the King, giving him council and direction in the management of the affairs of the nation. That men ſo living, and ſo educated, ſhould excel in philoſophy and every ſcience to which they applied, I think was of abſolute neceſſity, even if they had not been men of ſuperior genius and natural parts; which, however, it is certain that they were. They muſt, therefore, have excelled the Greeks and every other nation of thoſe days, in philoſophy and every art and ſcience, to which they applied. We need not wonder, therefore, that the Greeks got arts and ſciences from them in the earlieſt times; and that in later times, when they applied to philoſophy, what they had moſt valuable of that kind came from Egypt, as, I think, I have very clearly ſhown in the preface to the third volume of this work.

But, though the Egyptians appear to have cultivated every branch of ſcience, there were ſome arts which they did not at all cultivate, and others that they did not cultivate near ſo much as the Greeks. It does not appear that they had any poetry at all: And as to rhetoric, it could not exiſt in a government of which the people

ple had no ſhare. Muſic they ſtudied and practiſed: And, I think, there is no doubt, that the Greeks learned from them to carry their tetrachord, which was their moſt antient muſic riſing no higher than a fourth, up to the octave, and ſo to compleat the diatonic ſcale. But muſic was not uſed among the Egyptians, as it was among the Greeks, for pleaſure and entertainment; but was confined to the uſe of religion: And, therefore, no alteration or innovation was allowed in it any more than in their religion. Whereas among the Greeks it appears to have been one of their greateſt pleaſures, and a neceſſary part of another pleaſure of theirs, of which the Greeks, and particularly the Athenians, were exceedingly fond; I mean theatrical repreſentations, but of which there were none in Egypt. I am perſuaded, therefore, that the Egyptian muſic was much more ſimple than the Greek; and that they uſed neither the chromatic ſcale of muſic, nor the enharmonic, by which the tone was divided into three and into four parts, but uſed only the diatonic ſcale. Nor had they thoſe diviſions of muſic into different moods, called Ionic, Phrygian, and Dorian. Sculpture and Painting were practiſed in Egypt; and, I am perſuaded, the Greeks got thoſe two arts from that country, as well as every other; but they improved them very much. And, in general, they appear to have been formed by nature for the cultivation and improvement of what we call the *fine arts*, that is, arts of elegant pleaſure: And, accordingly, in theſe they excelled mankind.

As a King was a neceſſary part of the government of Egypt, it is proper that I ſhould ſpeak of the election of their Kings; a ſubject on which I find nothing written in any author antient or modern. That the royalty was hereditary in any family, there is no reaſon to believe. The King, therefore, muſt have been elected: And it would no doubt happen, that if the ſon of the preceding King was thought worthy, he would be elected; and, accordingly, there are many examples in the hiſtory of Egypt, given by Herodotus, of

Kings

Kings being ſucceeded by their ſons. The queſtion, therefore, is, Who were the electors? That he was not elected by any aſſembly of the people is evident; for there were no aſſemblies of the people in Egypt for any purpoſe whatever. Neither was there in Egypt any body of men, that might be called a ſenate, diſtinct from the Prieſts, that is, the counſellors of ſtate: And if ſo, I think it is evident, that the Prieſts, or wiſe men of the nation, muſt have been the electors; and, indeed, there were no men ſo fit for that buſineſs. One thing is certain, that, as Plato informs us, it was neceſſary, that every King, before he entered upon the exerciſe of his office, ſhould be admitted into the order of the Prieſts. This, I think, muſt have given them a negative in the election of every King, by whomſoever choſen. There was one of the Kings, who was himſelf a Prieſt; I mean the Prieſt of Vulcan. Now he could not, I think, have been elected, except by the Prieſts themſelves.

But though I be of opinion that the King was elected by the Prieſts of Egypt, it does not appear that he was ſo much under their power, as the King of Ethiopia was under the power of the Prieſts there, who, if the King diſpleaſed them, might ſend to him, to let him know, that he was not only to reſign his crown, but alſo his life, and to go out of the world by his own hand. At the ſame time, as the Egyptians were a colony of Ethiopians, as Diodorus tells us, (and I think it muſt have been ſo, as they were a black, wooly-haired, people as well as the Egyptians, and had many cuſtoms in common with the Egyptians, particularly the uſe of thoſe letters, which in Egypt were called *ſacred letters* and uſed only by the Prieſts, but in Ethiopia were in common uſe), I have very little doubt, that the Prieſts in Egypt, as well as thoſe in Ethiopia, had very great power over the King, and in all matters of State. This Diodorus Siculus tells us in his firſt Book, chap. 73. where he ſays, that they lived with the King, were his aſſiſtants in

buſineſs, and his teachers and inſtructors; and he has given us a very particular account of their manner of living, which, he ſays, he took from the books of the prieſts *. If, therefore, it be true, as Plato has ſaid, that it is only the government of philoſophers which can make a people happy, the Egyptians certainly enjoyed that happineſs, more than any people ever did.

There is one part of the Egyptian polity, of which I have not yet ſpoken, and with which I will conclude. It is, I think, a material part, and of very great importance. What I mean is the diviſion of the land of Egypt among the king, the prieſts, and the ſoldiers. I have juſt mentioned it in a preceding part of this volume †, where I have obſerved, that it was the antient feudal ſyſtem of Europe. I have been always a great admirer of that ſyſtem: But ſince I diſcovered that it was the wiſdom of the Egyptians, I admire it ſtill more, and particularly that part of it, which conſtituted a landed militia. The advantages of this inſtitution Diodorus has very well explained ‡: He ſays, it makes the ſoldiery encounter more chearfully the dangers of war, and fight for a country, of which they have ſo conſiderable a ſhare: 'For,' ſays he, 'it is 'abſurd to truſt the ſafety of a country to men, who have nothing in 'it to loſe of any value:' 'And, what, 'he adds,' is of the greateſt con-'ſequence, being well ſupplied with all the neceſſaries of life, they 'marry and beget children, and in that way increaſe the population 'of

* Diodorus Siculus, lib. 1. cap. 69. 70. and following, where this author informs us of a thing which I think remarkable, that the King was ſerved by no ſlaves, nor attended by any body, except the ſons, above 20 years of age, of Prieſts the moſt eminent for their knowledge, and theſe ſons themſelves diſtinguiſhed by their learning. And, upon this occaſion, he makes a very ſenſible obſervation, that kings do no very bad things, unleſs by the miniſtry of thoſe who attend them. Then he proceeds to tell us how the Kings divided the day betwixt public buſineſs, offices of religion, and ſtudy.

† Page 133.

‡ Lib 1. cap. 73.

'of the country, ſo that it needs no foreign ſupplies of men.' Now, in this reſpect, let us compare the ſtanding armies of Europe with the Egyptian military eſtabliſhment or with the feudal militia, which was not very long ago in Europe. The ſoldiers of a ſtanding army are little better than vagabonds, who have neither houſe nor home, nor any thing of value, for which it is worth their while to hazard their lives: So that it would be ridiculous to exhort them to fight pro *aris* et *focis*, as the antients exhorted their ſoldiers. And as to what Diodorus thinks of the greateſt importance in the Egyptian militia, the increaſe of the people, there are few of our ſoldiers married; and of their children, I am afraid, a very bad account is got. So that the race of the ſtrongeſt and ableſt bodied men among us, ſuch as the ſoldiers are or ought to be, may be ſaid to be loſt to the country. Now, this muſt have a very great effect, not only upon the numbers, but upon the ſize and ſtrength of men in the country.

CHAP. XI.

Obſervations to prove that the Egyptian form of government was moſt perfect.—The Egyptian government had not the fault of the heroic governments, nor of the later governments in Greece, that of being too popular.—The conſequence of a popular government is, giving power to men who can neither give nor take good council.—The government of Egypt had not another defect of the heroic governments in Greece, viz. that it was not fit for the cultivation of arts and ſciences.—Leiſure required for that, and a claſs of men ſet apart for that purpoſe.—This the Prieſts of Egypt had.—Antient learning never could have been reſtored in Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries, if men had not been ſet apart for that purpoſe.—Objection to the Egyptian government, that it was not a free government, ſuch as the heroic governments.—Anſwer, that it was not a popular government, and ſo much the better for not being ſuch;—reaſon for this.—Objection, that the people in Egypt were governed like ſlaves.—Anſwer, that they were ſo wiſe, as to ſubmit willingly to the government eſtabliſhed among them, and not to obey through fear or by compulſion.—This was the caſe of the Capadocians of old, and the Peaſants at preſent in Poland and Ruſſia.—The conſequences of the People being taken from their private buſineſs to attend the Public, is their poverty.—Examples of this in Athens and Rome.—They will deſire to make profit of the Public; and that will produce faction and corruption.—No Slaves in Egypt.—That proved by the ſilence of antient Authors upon that ſubject, and by the preſent practice in India.—Seſoſtris did not make Slaves of his Captives, but employed them in public works.—Slavery, an impolitical inſtitution,—not neceſſary in Egypt, as it was

in

in Greece and Rome.—No indigence in Egypt, ſuch as is in modern Nations, and was in antient times.—No money there.—Commerce carried on by exchange.—No great eſtates.—That prevented by the Agraran law, dividing the land among three orders of the State. —No foreign luxury in Egypt, as they had no trade with other countries.—A ſingular thing in the Hiſtory of Egypt, that they made no Provinces of the Countries they conquered,—nor impoſed any tribute upon them.—The Egyptians, not only happy themſelves, but a public bleſſing to mankind, by importing arts and civility among them.—The three great articles of the political ſyſtem, are the health, the morals, and the numbers of the people.—As to Health, the Egyptians the healthieſt of all civiliſed nations ;—uſed Phyſic, not only to cure diſeaſes, but to prevent them.—As to Morals—theſe better in Egypt than in other countries, becauſe they were the moſt religious of men,—and had not thoſe temptations to vice, which other nations have by wealth and by indigence.—Land, their only property ; which could not be accumulated in the hands of individuals.—As to Numbers, theſe were wonderful in Egypt.—A particular account of the number of Cities under Amaſis and Ptolemy Lagus.—This number of Cities more to be depended on than the numbering of Men.—Reaſons given for the wonderful increaſe of Men in Egypt.—All marrying, and having children.—All children brought up at the ſmalleſt expence.—And children not dying under age, as ſo many die among us.—One extraordinary reaſon for the increaſe of people, was the addition to the country of the Delta.—*This muſt have added very much to the numbers of the people, as well as to the increaſe of learning.—The Egyptian Government thus proved to be the beſt that ever exiſted; and the moſt fitted for the cultivation of arts and ſciences.— The duration of the Government of Egypt, a proof of its excellency. —No changes made in it during a prodigious number of years.— No diſputes about the ſucceſſion to the Crown, till the Greeks came*

among

among them.—The Ethiopian Kings to be conſidered as of the ſame country.—Proof of the perfection of the Government of Egypt, is the duration of the ſame Government in India, notwithſtanding all the conqueſts that have been made in that country.—People in India divided in the ſame manner as in Egypt.—The Hindoos of India, a very happy people.—Antient Egypt to be conſidered as preſerved in India.—The preſent ſtate of Egypt, compared with the antient, moſt lamentable.

IN the preceding chapter I have given the general plan of the Egyptian Conſtitution and Government. In this chapter, I propoſe to make ſome obſervations upon it, which I hope will convince the reader, if he be not already convinced, that it was the moſt perfect form of government that ever exiſted, and even more perfect than thoſe imaginary forms, which the Greek philoſophers deviſed, but which were never executed.

And, in the *firſt* place, I think I have proved very clearly, that the Egyptian polity had not that fault, which I have obſerved in the heroic governments of Greece, of giving the people too much power; for there it was they, who ultimately determined every thing; and in ſome of the ſtates in Greece, in later times, all diſtinction was aboliſhed betwixt the different ranks and orders of men, and the loweſt of the people governed as much as the higheſt. Now the people in all countries muſt neceſſarily conſiſt, for the greater part, of the third diviſion of men mentioned by Heſiod, that is, of men who can neither give good counſel, nor will take it. It is, therefore, not to be wondered, that though they ſometimes got good counſel from their orators, they did not take it: And it was a moſt ſenſible obſervation of a Scythian, who came to Greece, that the

wiſe

wiſe men among the Greeks, ſpoke and gave counſel, but the *fools* determined.

The other defect, which I have obſerved in the heroic governments, was, that they were not proper for the cultivation of arts and ſciences, by which only man in this life can make any progreſs towards recovering from his fallen ſtate. But there never was a government more fitted for the invention and cultivation of arts and ſciences, than the government of Egypt; for there the race of the beſt men, they had, was ſet apart for that purpoſe, having nothing elſe to do, (not even to provide for themſelves the neceſſaries of life,) except that they had the care of the religion of the country, and that ſome of them attended the king as his counſellors. Now I hold it to be impoſſible, that arts and ſciences ever could have been invented or cultivated in any great degree among a people wholly employed in procuring the neceſſaries of life, or in the practice of arms and government, which was the caſe of the people of Greece in the heroic age: For there muſt be men ſet apart for that purpoſe, and who have leiſure from the occupations of life.

If this had not been done when antient learning was revived in Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries,—if learning had not been then the public care, and if ſchools, colleges, and univerſities, had not been founded and endowed at a very conſiderable expence, it is to me evident, that antient learning would again have been loſt; and that we ſhould have been now as ignorant and barbarous as we were, when the Greeks imported their learning into Italy after the taking of Conſtantinople. This extraordinary care, therefore, that was taken to cultivate arts and ſciences in Egypt, where it was made a part of the conſtitution of their government, is of itſelf, I think, ſufficient to prove, that Egypt muſt have been the parent country of all arts and ſciences, unleſs it could be proved, that in thoſe early times,

times, there was any other nation who had ſuch an order of men among them.

It may be objected to the Egyptian government, that it was not a free government, ſuch as the heroic governments in Greece were, which I have praiſed ſo much. But the governments in Greece were popular governments, which cannot be free, unleſs the people be convinced before they act: Whereas the Egyptian government was not popular; and, I think, I have ſhewn, that it was ſo much the better, as it is impoſſible that the mere people can always be guided by the beſt counſel, but often by the worſt, either not having underſtanding ſufficient to perceive what is beſt of ſeveral things propoſed, or being miſguided by their paſſions. Of this I have ſhewn that the people of Athens were a ſtriking example; the cleverest people, perhaps, that ever exiſted, and yet they ruined themſelves by their folly and miſconduct.

But it will be ſaid, were the people of Egypt, then, governed, like ſlaves, by terror and compulſion; and was their only motive to obey the fear of puniſhment?—I ſay not: But as they were a very ſagacious people, and I believe as wiſe as any people ever were, though, perhaps, not ſo clever as the people of Athens, they would be ſenſible that they were very well governed, and better than if they had been under their own government. This is only ſuppoſing that they were as wiſe as the Capadocians, who, when they were offered liberty by the Romans, refuſed it, and choſe to continue under the government of their Kings. And I was informed by a Poliſh nobleman, (who, being deſcended of a Scotch family, as ſeveral of the Poliſh noblemen are, came to Scotland ſome years ago to ſee his relations, where I ſaw him), that a neighbour of his in Poland, having viſited England, in the courſe of his travels, fell there in love with Engliſh liberty ſo much, that, when he returned to his own country, he called together a meeting of his peaſants,

peaſants, and offered to emancipate them all, and leave them to be governed by themſelves; for the peaſants, both in Poland and Ruſſia, are no better than ſlaves to their landlords, as they were in Britain ſome hundred years ago. The peaſants of this nobleman thanked him for his generous offer, but ſaid they would conſider of it, and return by ſuch a day, and give him an anſwer. Accordingly, they came back on the day they had appointed, and told him, that they thought themſelves infinitely obliged to him for his generous offer, but that they did not chuſe to accept of it, being convinced that they were happier under his government, than they would be under their own. And I was acquainted with a Ruſſian gentleman, who told me, that the Ruſſian peaſants ſhew very great affection to their maſters; and he mentioned a fire which happened ſome years ago in the opera-houſe of Peterſburgh, when it was much crouded with company, where ſeveral of the peaſants loſt their lives in endeavouring to ſave their maſters. He told me alſo ſome ſtories of peaſants, who collected money among themſelves, (for theſe peaſants, though ſlaves, have land, which they cultivate and reap the fruits of), and moſt generouſly advanced it to pay their maſters debts, and ſave him from the neceſſity of ſelling his lands, and ſo giving them another maſter; for the peaſants there go along with the lands to the purchaſer.

Now, I think, we may ſuppoſe, that the Egyptians were not only as wiſe as the Capadocians, and the peaſants of the Poliſh nobleman above mentioned, ſo as to know that they were happier under the governors they had, than under their own government, but were as much attached to their governors, as the Ruſſian peaſants are to their maſters; and, if ſo, it is evident, that they were not governed as ſlaves, by terror and fear of puniſhment, but with their own free will and conſent, and with love and affection to their governors; and, that being the caſe, I think it is evident, that they were as well

well governed, as it is poſſible that *the mere people*, that is, men of Heſiod's third claſs, can be governed. The manner in which this rank of men was governed in Egypt, had this peculiar advantage, that they were not taken from the buſineſs or trade, which was aſſigned them, and to which they were educated, by any care for the public, which made a great difference betwixt them and the people in the cities in Greece and thoſe in Rome, where the people muſt have been much interrupted in their private buſineſs, by attending public aſſemblies, and diſcharging other offices of ſtate: The conſequence of which was, as we have ſeen in Athens, that the people could not live by their private induſtry, but were obliged to lay hold of the public money; and even with that, ſome of them went about begging: And in Rome, the poor's roll, in the time of Julius Caeſar, conſiſted, as I have ſhown elſewhere*, of 320,000, who lived by public diſtributions of corn. And, beſides this, a low man, who is taken from any ſervile buſineſs, and admitted to a ſhare of the government, will be apt to deſpiſe and neglect his proper buſineſs, and take himſelf entirely, or much more than he ought to do, to the buſineſs of the ſtate, in which he will endeavour to be a man of ſome conſideration, and to indemnify himſelf, for the loſs he ſuffers in his private buſineſs, by making profit of the public; and this neceſſarily will produce faction and corruption.

But though the people of Egypt had no ſhare in the government, I think I have ſhown very clearly that they were not governed like ſlaves: And, I ſay, farther, that even in private families, men were not governed in that way: Nor was there a claſs of men among the Egyptians, that was known by the name of ſlaves. Theſe were ſo numerous among the Greeks and Romans, that in ſome cities they equalled, if not exceeded, the number of freemen. But that there was no ſuch order of men in Egypt, I think, we may be ſure from the very particular account of that country, given us by Herodotus

* Origin of Language, vol. 5. p. 189.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, in which there is not a word ſaid of ſlaves among them, who, if they had exiſted, muſt have made a claſs of men very different from the other claſſes which they mentioned, not belonging to the public, like theſe other claſſes, but the property of their maſters; and if there were any doubt in the matter, the practice of India, which certainly got from Egypt its whole political ſyſtem, does, in my opinion, make the matter quite clear: For Diodorus tells us, that in his time there were no ſlaves in India. And I have information, which I can depend upon, that there are none at preſent among the native Indians, that is, the Hindoos; and, indeed, where there were men of all trades ready at hand to ſupply the wants of every man and every family, there was no need that men ſhould be kept in private families for that purpoſe, as they were among the Greeks and Romans. And, I think, ſlavery, conſidered in a political view, is a bad inſtitution; for it is a government within a government; and it is certainly improper, that citizens of the ſame ſtate ſhould be governed by the arbitrary will of any other citizen, and not by the laws of the ſtate. And, accordingly, in ſome countries, it has produced a great deal of miſchief by the inſurrection of ſlaves, and their revolt from ſuch an unnatural government. The Romans were engaged for ſome years in a dangerous war (*Servile Bellum*, as they called it,) with the ſlaves of Sicily and of the Southern parts of Italy; and the inhabitants of Argos in Greece had a long war with their rebellious ſlaves, in which they at laſt prevailed with much difficulty *. It appears, however, that ſometimes a man from another country was ſold in Egypt for a ſlave, as Joſeph was, by the Iſhmaelites, to Potipher; but there is not the leaſt evidence that any of the Egyptians were ſlaves, or that there was ſuch an order of men in Egypt. It does not appear, that Oſiris brought one captive from India to Egypt. Seſoſtris, indeed, returned to Egypt from his conqueſts with a great

* Herodotus, lib. 6. cap. 83.

number of captives. But they were not made domeſtic ſlaves to particular men, but were employed in public works; and in the ſame way the Iſraelites were employed by Pharoah. The ſingle inſtance, therefore, of Joſeph being ſold as a ſlave to a private man, does not prove that it was the general cuſtom of Egypt to make ſlaves even of foreigners; and, I think, the contrary is proved by the example of Seſoſtris.

Thus, I think, it appears, that the third race of men, which Heſiod, in the paſſage I have quoted *, mentions as uſeleſs, was far from being ſo in Egypt: But, on the contrary, they were moſt uſeful, and, I believe, as happy as by nature they were capable of being. For as men cannot be happy without a proper education, they were as well educated as was poſſible for qualifying them to diſcharge the ſeveral offices aſſigned them; for which, therefore, they were fitted by education, as well as by nature. Nor does it appear, that, in any country, ſo much attention was given to the education of the lower ſort: So that, if we could ſuppoſe, that education was the only thing neceſſary to form a good government, as the Greek philoſophers ſeem to ſuppoſe, there never was a country where it was more attended to than in Egypt. In other countries, no doubt, great attention has been given to the education of the men, who, by their rank in the ſtate, were entitled to govern. But in no country was there ever ſo much care taken of the education of the lower ſort; and the Greek philoſophers, who ſpeak ſo much of the education of the citizens, mention only the education of thoſe, who might govern as well as be governed: Which was the caſe of all the forms of government, that they have given us; and particularly of that which Ariſtotle thinks the beſt, and calls, by way of diſtinction, πολιτεια, where the citizens were all to govern and be governed in their turns, and to practiſe nothing but arms and government, while the neceſſary arts

* Page 177.

arts of life were to be carried on by ſlaves, or by barbarians living in their neighbourhood, whom Ariſtotle calls περιοικοι*. This is certainly a very narrow ſyſtem of government, and which muſt be confined to one city, and accordingly it is ſo, both by Ariſtotle and Plato: Whereas the Egyptian ſyſtem takes in a whole nation, and a moſt numerous nation, and provides men proper to diſcharge all the offices of life, even the meaneſt.

Further the diviſion of the people, into ſo many claſſes or *caſts*, as they are called in India, according to the different arts which they profeſs, muſt, I think, have made them excel more in their ſeveral arts and profeſſions, than, I believe, any people in any other country ever did. In other countries, and particularly in the popular governments of Greece, men had ſeveral employments: For beſides the particular art which they profeſſed, they had the buſineſs of the ſtate, to which they were obliged to attend. Thus a citizen of Athens, beſides his particular buſineſs, ſuch as that of a ſoldier, a ſailor, a merchant, or whatever other buſineſs he might think proper to apply to in order to acquire money, was obliged to attend the public aſſemblies, to be a judge, or to diſcharge any other office of the ſtate, that by lot might fall on him. Now, I ſay, it is impoſſible, when a man practices ſo many trades, that he can excel in any one of them†: Whereas the citizens of Egypt, following only one profeſſion, and being educated for that profeſſion in the beſt way poſſible, muſt have excelled in it. And there muſt have been an emulation among all thoſe practiſing the ſame profeſſion, which muſt have made them ſtrive to outdo one another. And this emulation would take place, not only in the lower claſſes, but alſo among the prieſts; where there would not only be emulation among

* Lib. 4. *de republicâ*. cap. 8. and 9. and lib. 7. cap. 13.

† Homer ſays of Margites, who was a *Jack of all Trades*, that

Πολλα δ'ιστατο εργα, κακως δ'ιστατο παντα.

mong thoſe of the ſame college, but among the different colleges, ſuch as thoſe of Thebes and of Heliopolis; which laſt, as Herodotus tells us, had the reputation of being the moſt learned. Now, it is emulation that makes men ſtrive to excel in the ſeveral arts and profeſſions; for it proceeds from a ſenſe of *honour*, the great animating principle of the political ſyſtem, and which gives life and vigour to all the actions of men both in public and private life; and, if that principle be well directed by the wiſdom of the ſtate, the government muſt neceſſarily be good and the people happy. It is this principle which diſtinguiſhes eſſentially, as I have obſerved *, a ſoldier from a ſlave, though he have no will of his own, but be governed entirely by his officer. It was this principle that made the king of Sparta and his 300 Spartiates, ſacrifice their lives ſo glorioufly for the liberties of Greece. It was the

——— Laudum immenſa cupido,

as Virgil expreſſes it, which made the Romans ſo great a people and ſo magnanimous, that 70,000. of them lay upon the field of battle of Cannae, without one man ſurrendering himſelf a priſoner†. And, to deſcend to common life, it is this principle which makes what we call *faſhion* among us, a law more prevalent than any law human or divine, though the ſanction of it be nothing elſe, but the want of the praiſe which we ſhould otherwiſe have had, if we had complied with the faſhion.

And this leads to an obſervation, which, I think, it is not improper here to make: As there can be no ſenſe of what is honourable and praiſe-worthy, without a ſenſe, at the ſame time, of what is beautiful, graceful, and becoming, in ſentiments and actions, this ſenſe is, therefore, not only the foundation of virtue and of the fine arts, but alſo of government; and, indeed, it appears, that there can be nothing

* Page 209. of this volume.

† See Vol. V. of Origin of Language p. 221.

nothing valuable among men without it; nor is there any ſentiment ſo univerſal among men. We have yet diſcovered no nation ſo barbarous, that has not ſome idea of beauty, at leaſt in outward form, and particularly in their own dreſs, if they have any. And even a ſenſe of the beauty of ſentiment and character, we find in people very little advanced in civility and the common arts of life, ſuch as the New Zealanders and the people of the Pelew Iſlands, of both of whom I have ſpoken elſewhere*; and in whatever we purſue, we think we perceive ſomething fine and praiſe-worthy. The love of money is one of our moſt ſordid paſſions; yet the miſer is vain of his money. Now, there cannot be vanity, as I have elſewhere ſhown†, without a ſenſe of the graceful and becoming; and ſuch monſters of gluttony, luxury, and intemperance of every kind, as Vitellius and Heliogabalus, thought, no doubt, that their manner of living was becoming and ſuitable to the dignity of a Roman emperor. In ſhort, it appears to me, that thoſe, who deny that any ſuch ſenſe is natural to man, are entirely ignorant of human nature, not knowing that it is the principle the moſt prevalent in it; and if it be perverted, it is the cauſe of almoſt all our vices and follies, and is the greateſt depravity of human nature, but, if rightly directed, it makes the greateſt perfection of our nature, and is the only ſource of happineſs to the intellectual nature, even to the divine: For God had pleaſure in the production of the univerſe, becauſe he ſaw that it was *beautiful;* for ſo the Hebrew word is tranſlated in the Septuagint.

As the proſperity of the nation is the end propoſed, or that ſhould be propoſed by government, let us conſider in this view the Egyptian government. The proſperity of every nation muſt depend upon three things; the health, the morals, and the numbers, of the people.

* Page 55. of this volume.

† Volume II. of this work p. 128.

people. Without health and morals, no people can be happy; and without numbers, they cannot be a great or powerful nation. As to the health of the people, we know very certainly that their neither is, nor ever was, upon the earth, a country where health was more ſtudied, or more proper means uſed, both to preſerve it, and to reſtore it when loſt. They had phyſicians for each diſeaſe; and they had preſcriptions for the cure of diſeaſes: And which preſcriptions had come down to them from the remoteſt antiquity, I think, very probably from the reigns of their Dæmons; which rules their phyſicians were obliged to follow: And if they deviated from them, it was at their own riſk; for if the patient died, they themſelves ſuffered death. But what I admire moſt in their phyſic, was their application of it, not only to the cure of diſeaſes, but to the prevention of them, and to the preſervation of health, which is of greater value than the reſtoring of it when loſt. For this purpoſe, Herodotus tells us, that they cleanſed their bodies very thoroughly by vomiting, purging, and glyſtering, for three days ſucceſſively in the beginning of each month. And the reaſon they gave for it was a good one, that, in ſuch a climate as theirs, there were not thoſe changes of weather, which produce ſo many diſeaſes in other countries: So that the only cauſe of diſeaſe, among them, was intemperance in eating and drinking; to prevent the effects of which, they cleanſed themſelves in the manner I have mentioned. This they practiſed when Herodotus was among them: But when Diodorus was there, they took their phyſic more frequently, but not at once, and not ſo violently; and the prieſts practiſed a regimen which I am ſure, from my own experience, muſt have contributed very much to their health; and that was bathing in cold water: This they did twice in the day, and as often at night. The conſequence of this care of health among the Egyptians was, as Herodotus informs us, that they were the healthieſt of all men, excepting only the Lybians, who lived the life of ſavages: And if we conſider that they

all

all lived in cities, which is certainly a life not ſo healthy as the country life, and that the land was overflowed, for ſome months in the year, by the river, during which time they may be ſaid to have lived in the water; this alone is a ſufficient proof, that, in the practice of this great art of the political ſyſtem, they muſt have excelled all the world.

As to Morals, I think, in that reſpect too, they muſt have exceeded all the civilized nations of which we have heard: For, in the firſt place, they were, as Herodotus tells us, the moſt religious of men. Now it is impoſſible that religion, eſpecially when it is ſuch a religion as the Egyptian, which, as I have obſerved, had nothing barbarous or inhuman in it, ſhould not improve the morals of men. Beſides that, they had not theſe two great diſeaſes of the political ſyſtem, which produce ſo much diſorder in it, and are the ſource of the greateſt part of the vices and crimes among men; I mean *wealth* and *indigence:* For, as they had no foreign commerce, they could not accumulate wealth in that way. Their whole wealth was their land; and it was divided in ſuch a way, that, I think, it was not poſſible that any man ſhould acquire wealth by the poſſeſſion of it: For the land all belonged to the King, to the Prieſts, or to the Soldiers. Now theſe orders of men poſſeſſed no lands themſelves, (for, otherwiſe, they muſt have gone out of the claſs in which they were placed by the conſtitution, and have become farmers), but had the rents paid by the farmers, or herdſmen, who poſſeſſed them, and who paid their rents to the King and to the other two claſſes of men; not however to the individuals of theſe claſſes, but to the whole of them, to be divided among them. The Egyptians, therefore, may be ſaid to have enjoyed that bleſſing, which *Agur* prayed for, of neither poverty nor wealth. Neither had they, as I have obſerved, any foreign commerce, by which we know that vices as well as diſeaſes are imported into a country; and even the commerce in their own country was carried on, not by money, as among us, but in the antient pri-

mitive way by exchange of commodities. For Herodotus tells us, that the Lydians were the firſt who coined money*: And from the ſame author we learn, that the Egyptians borrowed none of their cuſtoms from other nations. It is true, that the Egyptians had a great deal of gold and ſilver, more perhaps than any other people ever had. But there is no evidence that they coined any of it, any more than the Greeks did at the time of the Trojan war, who had alſo gold and ſilver among them, which they gave in exchange for other commodities, weighing it in talents; and in this way it no doubt paſſed among the Egyptians. The Egyptians, therefore, had not among them that *root of all evil*, money, which, by its accumulation and eaſy circulation, does more miſchief than any other kind of wealth, and is more productive of thoſe two great diſeaſes of the political body, the wealth of the few, and the indigence of the many; and beſides, it makes a greater and quicker circulation of vice and folly in a country, than commerce by exchange can do.—That there could not be great wealth in Egypt, I have already ſhown: And as to indigence among them, neither Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, nor any other author, who has treated of Egypt, have ſaid a word of it; which they certainly would not have failed to have done, if it had been ſo great as it was in ſome other antient ſtates, ſuch as that of Athens and Rome. If any man was to give ſuch a deſcription of England, as Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus have given us of Egypt, he would not omit to tell us, that a very conſiderable part of the people ſubſiſted upon public or private charity. From the ſilence, therefore, of authors with reſpect to a thing of ſuch importance in the polity of a country, I think I may infer, that there was no ſuch indigence in Egypt, as we hear of in other countries, both antient and modern. And, if there was no ſuch indigence, I think, we may infer, that there were no very great eſtates, nor any great inequality in the fortunes of private men; for great wealth of ſome private men, and great poverty of others, have always

* Lib. 1. cap. 94.

ways gone together in all countries. But in thoſe countries, wealth conſiſted chiefly in coined money, which, as it circulates in the eaſieſt and moſt private way, enables men to collect wealth much more eaſily than they can do, when gold and ſilver is only a commodity like herds and flocks.

There was not, therefore, in Egypt that inequality of fortune among the citizens, that has produced ſo much diſorder in other ſtates. And, indeed, I may ſay, that the diſtinction of rich and poor has produced more internal diſturbances, more factions and diſorders, which have very often ended in the ruin of the ſtate, than perhaps any other thing. And as the Egyptians had not money, nor any trade with foreign countries, they had no foreign luxury, but lived entirely upon the produce of their own country.

The laſt great article in the ſyſtem of government is the Numbers of the people. In this the Egyptians appear to me to have exceeded all the nations that ever exiſted, without exception even of the Indian, which, we are told, was in antient times a very populous nation, and is ſo at this day. In the reign of Amaſis, Herodotus tells us, that there were 20,000 cities in Egypt. Diodorus makes them only 18,000; and ſays, that was the number recorded in the books of the Prieſts *. And even after they had fallen under the dominion of the Perſians, and then of the Macedonians, their numbers continued to increaſe, their polity ſtill remaining the ſame: For Diodorus tells us, that under Ptolemy Lagus, the number of their cities amounted to 30,000; which number, he ſays, continued to his time †. And we are not to ſuppoſe, that what they called cities were nothing but ſmall villages; but, that they were truly what might be called cities, ſome of them no doubt greater or leſſer than

* Lib. 1. cap. 31.

† Ibidem.

others; for, as the people lived altogether in cities, (and indeed they could not live otherwiſe during the months that the country was overflowed), and as thoſe cities were raiſed upon mounts, at a great expence of labour, to ſecure them againſt the inundation, we muſt ſuppoſe that they conſiſted of a great number of houſes, and were inhabited by many men, who otherwiſe could not have lived in the country. The way that we commonly judge of the populouſneſs of countries, is by the numbers of the individuals living in it; and we ſay, that in ſuch or ſuch a country there are ſo many millions of men. But to aſcertain this, is a matter of very great difficulty; nor do I know, that the numbers of people in any country have been properly aſcertained in that way. Whereas the cities in a country may be eaſily numbered: So that, I think, that, in counting the cities in Egypt, there could hardly be any miſtake.

This number of people will not appear incredible, even in ſo ſmall a country as Egypt, which was no more than a valley betwixt the Arabian Mountains on one ſide, and the Lybian on the other, if we conſider the manners and cuſtoms of the people. Among them, I am perſuaded, every man was married; and, that, they held it to be a religious duty to communicate to children the life that they had got from their parents. This is the opinion of the Indians at this day; and, as I am perſuaded they got their cuſtoms and manners, as well as their polity and their arts and ſciences, from the Egyptians, I think it is highly probable, that they adopted this Egyptian cuſtom likewiſe. Then there was no ſuch thing as expoſing children among the Egyptians, ſuch as was practiſed among the Greeks and Romans; but all their children, legitimate and illegitimate, were brought up, and at the ſmalleſt expence, chiefly upon the herbs which the river produced, as Diodorus Siculus informs us. Then that vice, which was ſo common among the Greeks and Romans,

and

and which, as Ariſtotle informs us *, was permitted, and even encouraged by the polity of Crete, in order to prevent the too great increaſe of the people, I mean ſodomy, was not known in Egypt. And when to theſe conſiderations we join this, that in ſo healthy a country as Egypt, few or no children would die under age; whereas, among us, many more than a half that are born, do not live to be men and women;—When we join, I ſay, all theſe conſiderations together, it will by no means appear incredible, that the numbers of people in Egypt ſhould have been ſo very great; ſo great, that they muſt have been quite overſtocked with people, many more than their land or water, fruitful as they were, could maintain, and that in not many generations, if they had not diſcharged themſelves by colonies, which they ſent to different countries, by which they at the ſame time propagated their arts and ſciences. Of theſe colonies their Prieſts named many, which no doubt were ſet down in their ſacred books, but of ſome of which the Greek hiſtorians ſeem to have doubted. But, for my part, though they had not ſaid a word of the colonies they ſent out, I ſhould have believed, that it was impoſſible by the nature of things, that they muſt not have ſent out a great many.

What made the numbers of the people in Egypt ſo very great, was a thing which happened in Egypt, and I believe no where elſe. In other countries a great deal of land has, at ſome time or another, been inundated by the ſea, or by rivers, and in that way ſo much land taken from the inhabitants: Whereas in Egypt there was a very great addition made to the country; and which I think muſt have been richer, and more productive of every thing for the ſuſtenance of man, than the old country. What I mean is the addition of the Delta, or lower Egypt, to the upper; which addition, as Herodotus tells us, was the gift of the river, being produced by the earth, which the river brought with it from

* Lib. 2. *De Republica*, cap. 10.

from Æthopia when it overflowed. This addition began to be made after the reign of the Gods, as the Egyptians called their Daemon Kings, had ceaſed. Such an increaſe of land muſt have made a wonderful increaſe of people, more than, I believe, were in Upper Egypt. And this new created land muſt have added not only a great deal to the numbers of the people, but alſo to the progreſs of learning and of arts and ſciences. In Upper Egypt it does not appear that there was more than one college of Prieſts, that of Thebes; but in the Delta there were ſeveral, and particularly one, mentioned by Herodotus, at Heliopolis, where he ſays, there were the moſt learned Prieſts with whom he converſed. Now it is evident, that by the increaſe of the number of colleges, learning muſt have been increaſed; for beſides the increaſe of the numbers employed in learning, there muſt have been, as I have obſerved, an emulation among the ſeveral colleges, which muſt have contributed very much to the advancement of knowledge. I will only add farther upon this ſubject, that this ſo wonderful an event, as the creation of a new country, muſt have happened by the providence of God, which had deſtined that Egypt ſhould be the parent country of all arts and ſciences; and for that purpoſe ſhould abound more than any other country in numbers of men, ſo as to be able by the colonies, which it ſent out, to propagate arts and ſciences all over the earth then known; for which purpoſe Egypt, as I ſhall ſhow afterwards, was better ſituated than any other country.

Thus I think I have proved that the Egyptian government anſwered the three great purpoſes propoſed by government, the Health, the Morals, and the Numbers of the people.

And thus much may ſuffice for the internal government of Egypt. As to their tranſactions with other nations, their government was in this reſpect more remarkable, perhaps, and more diſtinguiſhed from that

that of other nations, than in any thing elſe that I have mentioned. They were the greateſt conquerors of whom we read: Their Daemon King, Oſiris, overran a great part of India: And their human King, Seſoſtris, went ſtill farther in that country, and paſt the Ganges, which neither Oſiris nor Alexander did; and he appears to have overrun all the reſt of Aſia, and a part of Europe as far as Thrace. But they made no provinces of the countries they conquered, as the Romans did; nor impoſed any tribute upon them. Oſiris overran that great country of India, for no other purpoſe, as appears, except to introduce among them civility and arts; and Seſoſtris, though he was in India too, and made great conqueſts in Aſia, and even in Europe, and though he made captives whom he employed in the way I have mentioned *, impoſed no tribute upon the nations he conquered, nor gave them any king or ruler, but left them to chuſe rulers for themſelves, and to be governed by their own laws.

The Egyptians, therefore, did not erect a great Empire, ſuch as thoſe of the Aſſyrians, Medes, Perſians, Macedonians, and Romans; which I hold to have been the principal cauſes of the preſent deſolation of the Earth: Whereas the Egyptians peopled ſeveral countries with their colonies, and propagated their arts and ſciences to the moſt diſtant parts of the earth. The polity of the Egyptians, therefore, not only made themſelves very happy, but may be ſaid to have been a bleſſing to human kind, and the greateſt bleſſing that man can beſtow upon man, if it be true, as I think I ſhall ſhow it is, that from Egypt all arts and ſciences are originally derived.

Such being the nature of the Egyptian government, both at home and abroad, I think I may conclude, that it was more perfect than any government that ever exiſted on this earth, or was imagined by the

* See p. 227.

the Greek philoſophers; that it was as perfect as any government on this earth can be; and that the people, who lived under it, muſt have been very happy, and indeed I believe the happieſt of men: Nor do I think they could have been otherwiſe, as they were governed not only by religion, but by philoſophy, without which, as Plato tells us, no people can be happy; nor can there, ſays he, be any end of human miſery, unleſs kings become philoſophers, or philoſophers kings.

If any doubt ſhould remain of the government of Eygpt being ſo perfect a government, the duration of it would be ſufficient proof: For in government, as well as in every thing elſe, what is moſt perfect in the form will laſt the longeſt. Of the duration of the government of Egypt I have already ſpoken*. It is proved by a chronological monument, ſuch as is not to be found, nor ever was to be found, in any other country in the world; I mean the ſtatues of the High Prieſts of Jupiter in Thebes: And, beſides theſe, the numbers of the years of the reigns of their Kings were ſet down, as Herodotus informs us, in the books of their Prieſts, whoſe account of theſe Kings was ſo exact, that they ſet down their ſtature, as Diodorus Siculus informs us. During all this prodigious number of years which their government laſted, from Menes their firſt human King, (for I reckon not the reigns of their Gods, though I believe them to have been as real Kings as the human Kings, and their reigns were very much longer), down to the Perſian conqueſt, there was no change of the government; nor during all that time was there ſo much as an attempt to change the government, or any rebellion againſt their eſtabliſhed Kings, or aſſaſſination of them, nor any thing that can poſſibly be called a civil war, though, after the Greeks had found the way into the country, there were two diſputes about the ſucceſſion to the Crown, but each of them was terminated

* Page 133.

minated by a ſingle battle: And there were no proſcriptions and capital puniſhments, ſuch as accompanied the civil wars in Rome, or maſſacres, ſuch as we read of in other countries upon like occaſions. As to the Æthiopian Kings, who reigned in Egypt, it appears that they got the Crown without any conqueſt or civil war: And as the Egyptians were undoubtedly a colony from Æthiopia, as Diodorus has ſhown, (who ſays, that the land of Egypt, as well as the people, came from Æthiopia), I think it is likely that they ſucceeded with the conſent of the nation; for the Crown in Egypt does not appear to have ever been hereditary or the property of any family. One of theſe Æthiopian Kings, after he had reigned ſome years, voluntarily reſigned the Crown: Nor does it appear, that any of them made, or attempted to make, any change in the conſtitution or form of government, nor introduced any new manners or cuſtoms among the people. And, indeed, the manners of the two countries were ſo like, that there could hardly be any thing of that kind: And the form of government in both countries was ſo far the ſame, that the Prieſts were the governing men.

Thus it appears, that the government in Egypt had every mark of a perfect form of Government, and particularly its duration, which, compared with that of other governments, of which we read, is moſt extraordinary; nor is there any thing like it to be found in the hiſtory of man, except the duration of the Polity of India, which, as it was derived from the Polity of Egypt, is another proof of the excellence of that polity. The Polity of India ſtill continues the ſame, notwithſtanding the many eſtabliſhments of foreigners in that country, and the many conqueſts that have been made of it, firſt by Gengiſchan, then by Tamerlane and the Mogul Tartars, after them by the French and Engliſh, who are in poſſeſſion at preſent of a great part of the country; and the Portugeeſe have alſo ſettlements there: Yet, notwithſtanding all theſe conqueſts, and the frequent intercourſe they

muſt have had with ſo many foreigners ſettled in their country, the Hindoos, that is the native Indians, preſerve the antient form of polity, by which the people were divided into ſo many claſſes, or *caſts*, as the Indians call them, kept diſtinct from one another, and not intermixed by marriages. The firſt of theſe caſts is the Bramins, who are preciſely what the Prieſts in Egypt were; for they have the care of the religion of the country. They are the councillors of the Rajahs or antient Princes of the country; and they are the depoſitaries of the arts and ſciences, which the Egyptians imported into India, and particularly of that language, of moſt wonderful art, called the Shanſcrit, and which I hope to be able to prove was the antient language of Egypt. They have alſo a military caſt, which they call Rajaputs: and who are ſo much fitted, both by their nature and education, to be ſoldiers, that, as I am informed by our officers who have been in India, they are the beſt men among our Seapoys, when they can be got; but it is not eaſy to get them, as they are of ſo dignified a caſt. And, beſides theſe two higheſt caſts, they have inferior caſts, ſuch as thoſe of farmers, herdſmen, &c.; and which are all kept ſeparate from one another, as the ſame claſſes were in Egypt. And, as the Egyptians were ſo happy under their government, the Indians, I am told, are likewiſe very happy under the ſame form of government, notwithſtanding all the diſturbances that they have met with in later times from foreigners; but which have made them alter nothing of their cuſtoms and manners. Mr Haſtings, who is a man of great ſenſe and obſervation as well as of learning, and who was 32 years in India, and governor there for 13 of theſe years, tells me, that he thinks them the happieſt people he has ever known: And, as to their polity, he ſays, that their diviſion into caſts, (a ſingularity of the Egyptian government, which is only preſerved in India), makes all their buſineſs of life go on much better than it would otherwiſe do; as they have there no man of many trades, but every man has a buſineſs of his own, to which he wholly applies himſelf. And, indeed, that the diviſion of the

ſeveral

ſeveral arts and profeſſions among different claſſes of men, who, by nature and education, were fitted to excel in thoſe ſeveral arts, was a moſt wiſe and political inſtitution, I think, cannot be doubted; for, if men in a ſtate are at liberty to practiſe any buſineſs or profeſſion, without being fitted for it either by nature or education, the conſequence neceſſarily muſt be, that thoſe arts will, for the greater part, be very ill practiſed. If in a private family, the ſervants have not each of them a particular buſineſs allotted them, but every one of them is to do every thing, it is evident that the whole buſineſs of that family will be very ill managed. Now, a ſtate is to be conſidered as a great family; and, indeed, all ſtates were originally compoſed of aſſociations of families *.

It may be alſo obſerved, as one great advantage of this diviſion of the people according to their ſeveral occupations, that every man muſt be contented with his own ſituation ſo far, at leaſt, that he cannot aſpire to be of any higher caſt; and therefore his only ambition muſt be, to excel in his own Caſt: Whereas in other countries, where there are no ſuch claſſes of men, there are no bounds ſet to the ambition of any man, but every man attempts to riſe as high as he can. Now, this muſt needs make men unquiet and diſcontented. The incapacity, therefore, of riſing higher than their Caſt, muſt, I think, of itſelf, make the Hindoos happier than the people of other countries. The only ambition they can have, is to excel in their ſeveral profeſſions, and in no other. And this ambition muſt produce an emulation, which, as I have obſerved, muſt make them excel in their ſeveral arts; and which muſt be much greater among thoſe of the ſame art, than among thoſe profeſſing different arts; and, indeed, among theſe there can hardly be any emulation at all, eſpecially when it is impoſſible that a man of the lower caſt can riſe to a higher. He therefore will not compare himſelf with thoſe above him, but will be contented if he can out do thoſe of the ſame

* See p. 176. of this vol.

caſt: And this, among others, I think, is one great advantage of the diviſion of the people into claſſes according to their ſeveral employments. For my own part, I have heard ſo much of the Hindoos, and of the bravery and fidelity of thoſe who are in our ſervice, that there is no people I ſhould deſire more to be acquainted with; and if I could acquire knowledge enough of their learned language, ſo as to read their books of ſcience, of which, I am informed by Sir William Jones, they have a great many upon every ſubject, I believe I ſhould learn more of the antient Egyptian philoſophy, which was brought to Greece by Pythagoras, and which I hold to be the only genuine philoſophy, than is to be found in the Greek books. In ſhort, I conſider India as Egypt ſtill preſerved to us; and, if I were there, I ſhould conſider myſelf as in the parent country of all arts and ſciences, where they were beſt cultivated, and brought to the greateſt degree of perfection.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Compariſon of the preſent State of Egypt with its antient State.—The change more for the worſe than in any other country.—In Herodotus's time, it was a country more wonderful than all the other countries upon earth.—Of its climate, and its river.—The climate not liable to exceſs either of hot or cold, dry or wet.—The changes of theſe produce many diſeaſes among men.—The river more wonderful than the climate.—It has created a country in Egypt,—and makes this country wonderfully fruitful by renewing the ſoil of it.—Without that, the land of Egypt could not have laſted or maintained ſo many people.—Examples to prove this.—The Nile made agriculture in Egypt a very eaſy art, which is ſo laborious in other countries.—It delivered them from the reproach of feeding upon dung.—The river, beſides, yeilded many plants of different kinds, upon which the inhabitants of the marſhy part of Egypt lived.—The land of Egypt fertile as well as the water.—It produced wheat and barley which grew wild there, and no where elſe.—Of the works of art in Egypt.—The firſt *and greateſt work of that kind, the mounds of earth, upon which the cities were built, and without which the country could not have been inhabited.--The* ſecond *great work of art in Egypt, was the Lake of Mæris;--a moſt uſeful work,--of wonderful circumference and depth.—The* third *great work of Egypt, was the Labyrinth.—The* fourth, *the Pyramids,—the laſt of the great works of Egypt, as Herodotus has arranged them, but ſuch, that, if they had not been ſtill extant, we could not have believed in the other wonders of Egypt.—The greateſt work of art among the Egyptians, was their Government,—the ſubject of which was* Men, *and*

and not materials ſuch as ſtone and brick.—In this they exceeded all the world.—All theſe arts, joined with their prodigeous numbers, and the arts and ſciences they invented, make them the moſt wonderful people on earth.—Of the preſent ſtate of Egypt,—wonderfully changed for the worſe,—firſt, as to the numbers of the people.—The antient Egyptian Race not to be found in Egypt: So that the nation may be ſaid to be annihilated.—Inſtead of being the moſt fruitful country in the world, not able to maintain the few inhabitants that are in it: And, inſtead of being the healthieſt country in the world, it is now the ſeat of diſeaſe.

IN this chapter I propoſe to compare the antient with the preſent ſtate of Egypt; a compariſon which will exhibit an alteration, and a change for the worſe, ſuch as is not to be found in any other country upon the earth, though in all countries the changes have been very great in latter times, and I am afraid none for the better.

Herodotus has ſaid, that, in his time, Egypt exhibited more wonders, both of nature and of art, than all the countries of the earth put together *: And he mentions particularly their heaven, or climate they enjoyed, and their river ſo different from other rivers, and alſo the manners of the people. As to their climate, the country is in ſuch a latitude, as not to be liable to any exceſs, either of heat or cold, nor of dry or of wet. In Upper Egypt it never rains; or if it did, it was, in antient times, accounted a prodigy; which, Herodotus tells us, was the caſe before the Perſian conqueſt; and then it only rained in drops: And in Lower Egypt it rains but ſeldom; nor have they any of thoſe fogs or miſts, which make other climates, leſs favoured by Heaven, ſo unwholeſome. They have not, therefore, that ſucceſſion of hot and cold, dry and moiſt, nor in general that

* Lib. 2. cap. 35.

that change of weather, which, as the ſame author obſerves, affects the human body ſo much, and produces ſo many diſeaſes.

Their river was ſtill more wonderful than their ſky; for there may perhaps be other climates as good as that of Egypt, but there is no river, known, like the Nile, or which has produced ſo wonderful an effect as the production of a great country; I mean the *Delta*, which, as Herodotus tells us, was the gift of the river: And not only has produced it, but, by annually overflowing it and the Upper Egypt, has made them both the moſt fruitful countries in the world. Other rivers by overflowing only water the ſoil, and prevent the bad effects of exceſſive drought; whereas the Nile not only waters the ſoil, but annually renews it, by bringing from Æthiopia a very rich earth, which it depoſits upon the plains of Egypt, while it ſtagnates. Nor do I think it is poſſible, that, without ſuch renewal, Egypt could have maintained ſo many millions of people for ſo many thouſand years, nor have invented ſo many arts and ſciences, and by their colonies propagated them to ſo many countries. For the ſame ſoil, however good, muſt be exhauſted at laſt by continued cropping for a great number of years, notwithſtanding any dung we can give it; for we carry off, in every crop, more of the vegetable earth than we can add to it by the richeſt dunging; and of what remains we exhauſt at laſt the ſeminal virtue. I was told by a gentleman employed by Government to ſurvey the Weſt India Iſlands, which we took from the French in the war before the laſt, that he was informed, that ſome of theſe Iſlands, when they were firſt cultivated, produced 20 crops of ſugar without dung or changing the plant; whereas in our Iſland of Barbadoes, which has been very long in culture, they muſt dung and change the plant every year. Paleſtine, which was once a moſt fruitful country, and maintained a prodigious number of inhabitants, is now ſo much exhauſted, that it is little better than a ſandy deſert.

The

The Nile, by overflowing and renewing the ſoil, made agriculture, which in other countries is an art requiring much labour and ſkill, a matter of great eaſe in Egypt: For, as Herodotus has told us*, the farmer there, was not obliged to plough or dig the ground; but after the river was retired, he had no more to do, but to ſow his ſeed upon the wet mud, and then employ ſwine to tread it in; and in this way he had a plentiful crop, which he ſaved himſelf alſo the trouble of threſhing by treading the grain out with ſwine.

Another advantage the Egyptians had by the overflowing of the river was, that they eſcaped the reproach which the King of Æthiopia caſt upon the Perſians, that they lived upon dung; for having aſked the Perſian ambaſſadors upon what they lived, and being told it was upon wheat, which was raiſed among them, as among us, from land dunged, he ſaid that it was no wonder that they lived ſo ſhort time, when they fed upon dung †: And it is certain, that all the fruits of the earth muſt have in them more or leſs of the manure by which they are raiſed and nouriſhed: And I have no doubt, but that many diſeaſes are produced among us and other nations in Europe by our being fed in that way; and I hold it to be one reaſon of the great health of the Egyptians, that all the corn they ate was not raiſed from dung, but from new earth brought down by the river. Whereas, we feed upon fruits raiſed in our fields and gardens from the dung of other animals; and thoſe, who live in great towns, feed upon fruits, a great part of which is raiſed from their own dung; for that is a principal part of the manure of fields and gardens near to a great city. Now, we can hardly imagine a food more unnatural than this.

And not only did the river produce the moſt plentiful crops without any culture, but it abounded ſo much with fiſh, and with herbs, which

* Lib. 2. cap. 14. † Herodotus, Lib. 3. cap. 22.

which it produced, particularly the *Lotus*, *Agroſtis*, and *Biblus*, that it maintained numbers of men without the uſe of any corn: For Herodotus mentions a part of Egypt which was altogether marſhy, where the inhabitants neither ſowed nor reaped, but lived entirely upon the produce of the river; and Diodorus Siculus tells us, that, even in the country that was ſown, the children were brought up chiefly upon plants that grew in the river, with little or no expence to their parents.

But not only was the water thus bountiful to the inhabitants, but the earth, I imagine, was of the beſt kind, producing plants which were to be found in no other country: So that I believe we owe to Egypt the very bread we eat; for wheat and barley, and every other ſpecies of grain, muſt have grown wild in ſome country before they were cultivated; and, accordingly, Diodorus Siculus tells us, that the wheat was a wild plant in Egypt before Iſis taught the people the culture of it. Now, I do not believe that the common wheat, and much leſs the fineſt kind of it, which they called *Zea*, and which was the *Far* of the Romans, and the food of the beſt people in Egypt*, is, at preſent, or was, at any time, the natural produce of any other country. The barley, too, of which we make our ale, and upon which the Greeks fed before they got the uſe of wheat, was, I am perſuaded, likewiſe a native of Egypt, and of no other country; and ſo alſo was the vine, which Oſiris carried to India and taught the Indians the culture of. And if it went as far as India, we may preſume that it went to Greece, and that the Greeks learned the culture of it, as well as other arts, from the Egyptians.

Herodotus has likewiſe mentioned the works of art in Egypt, as being moſt wonderful, as well as thoſe of nature. I will ſay ſomething upon this ſubject likewiſe; and, I will begin with one of them, which, I think, was as neceſſary as it was wonderful, and in that

 reſpect

* Herodotus, Lib. 2. cap. 36.

reſpect differed materially from the Pyramids, which, though works very wonderful, were certainly not neceſſary; and it differed from the Pyramids alſo in this reſpect, that the Pyramids were confined to particular ſpots, whereas this great work was all over the country. The work I mean is, the building of ſo many cities upon mounds of earth, raiſed above the overflowing of the river; without which the country could not have been inhabited for near one half of the year, as Herodotus informs us *. Now what a labour it muſt have been to place not ſingle houſes, but cities, to the number of 20,000, upon the tops of artificial mounds. How high thoſe mounds muſt have been, we may judge from what Herodotus tells us of the overflowing of the river, which, he ſays, covered not only the Delta of Egypt, but ſometimes a part of Lybia upon one ſide, and of Arabia on the other ſide, and to the extent of two days journey on each ſide †: And more particularly he informs us, that, in his time, if it did not riſe 15 or 16 cubits at leaſt, it did not cover the country ‡; ſo that the mounds, upon which the cities were built, muſt have been more than 24 feet high. When the river overflowed, the whole of Egypt was a ſea, and the cities only appeared; which, therefore, he compares to the Cyclade Iſlands in the Egæan Sea ‖, that is what we call the Archipelago Iſlands. To this work of nature, I think it was not improper to compare this greateſt, and, at the ſame time, moſt uſeful, work of man.

The next moſt uſeful work of the Egyptians, and the moſt wonderful too, was the Lake Mæris, which was about 400 Engliſh miles in circumference, and 50 fathoms deep where it was deepeſt. This lake received the waters of the Nile when it overflowed, and retained them when it retired: So that it was a reſervoir for thoſe waters, from

* Lib. 2. cap. 19.

† Ibidem.

‡ Ibid. cap. 13.

‖ Ibid. cap. 96. Diod. Siculus ſays the ſame thing. Lib. 1. cap. 23.

from which they were derived by many canals to every part of the country, which wanted them. Of this wonderful work a ſmall remain is yet to be ſeen.

The next moſt wonderful work in Egypt was, the Palace of the 12 Kings, built in the form of a Labyrinth. Of this there is no veſtige, as far as I know, remaining.

The laſt of the wonders of art in this country, were the Pyramids; of which there are three ſtill remaining, one of theſe called the Great Pyramid, of ſtupenduous ſize, covering about eight acres of ground as it ſtands at preſent; but it muſt have covered more when Herodotus ſaw it, according to his deſcription of it. If theſe Pyramids had not been ſtill extant, I doubt whether we ſhould have believed in the other wonders of Egypt related to us by Herodotus. And, yet the Pyramids were the leaſt of the wonders of the works of men in Egypt, according to the account Herodotus gives of them; for he ſays the Labyrinth exceeded the Pyramids, as much as it was exceeded by the Lake Mæris.

But I have not yet mentioned the greateſt of all the arts, in which they excelled; the materials of which are not ſtone and mortar, earth or water, but men, the nobleſt ſubject of art upon this earth. By this deſcription the reader will readily underſtand that I mean the art of government, in which I think I have ſhown that the Egyptians exceeded all the world. When to theſe works of nature and of art I join the prodigious numbers of the people, their genius, and their invention of ſo many arts and ſciences, their conqueſts too, and the uſe they made of theſe conqueſts, I think we need not heſitate to pronounce, with Herodotus*, that Egypt was the moſt wonderful country on earth, and more wonderful than all the other countries put together. And, I think, I may add with Diodorus

* Herod. Lib. 2. cap. 35.

Siculus *, that they were a moſt happy people, enjoying all thoſe advantages from nature, which I have mentioned, of air, earth, and water; likewiſe a form of government, which, I think, I have ſhown to be the beſt that ever was practiſed or even imagined; and beſides all theſe, the arts and ſciences they invented, by which they made the civil life compleat.

Let us now compare the preſent ſtate of Egypt with its antient ſtate, as I have deſcribed it; and the change for the worſe will appear wonderful;—greater, as I have ſaid, than is to be found in any other country on earth. Egypt was once, as I have ſhown, the moſt populous country in the world; and now it may be ſaid to be a deſert compared with what it was formerly. It is inhabited at preſent by Turks and Arabs, and a mongrel race of people, they call *Copts*, who have a mixture, it is ſaid, of the antient Egyptian blood. But black, woolly-haired men, ſuch as the antient Egyptians were, but with features very different from thoſe of the negroes, are not now to be found in Egypt; and, according to my information, are only to be ſeen in the Iſland of Meroe, formed by the Nile in Æthiopia, but who probably are Æthiopians; ſo that the whole Egyptian nation may be ſaid to be extinct. Inſtead of being the beſt governed country, as it formerly was, I believe there is no country at preſent worſe governed.

There was a Scotch ſhip from Aberdeen, which, a year or two ago, went to the Levant, and was employed to carry corn from different parts of Africa to Alexandria. And, though there had been a great many ſhips, before this Aberdeen ſhip, employed in the ſame way, yet, when ſhe came to Alexandria with her cargo of corn, there were people dying every day of hunger. This information I had from one of the ſailors; who told me that the ſcarcity was not

* Lib. 1. cap. 69.

not owing to the Nile not overflowing as uſual, but to the bad government of the country, and the neglect of agriculture Now, how extraordinary a change is this, from a country ſo populous as antient Egypt was, and abounding ſo much with corn and every other neceſſary of life, to a country ſo thinly inhabited as Egypt is at preſent, and where the few, that are left in it, are dying for want of bread? Inſtead of being the healthieſt of all civilized countries, it may now be ſaid to be the ſeat of diſeaſe: For the plague is ſeldom out of it; and almoſt all the plagues, which at different times have afflicted Europe, have come originally from Egypt. And beſides the plague, which at times makes prodigious havoc among them, they are eaten while alive by worms, and particularly by one very great worm, called the tape-worm *.

* See Haſſelquiſt's Travels.

CHAP. XIII.

Recapitulation of what has been ſaid in the former chapter.—The ſubject of the origin of the arts and ſciences continued.—The art of government invented in Egypt, and brought to perfection.—Of the neceſſary arts of life there invented.—Language alſo will be ſhown to have been there invented.—The uſe of fire diſcovered in Egypt;—and the uſe of it in making glaſs, which was unknown to the Greeks and Romans.—Glaſs coloured like precious ſtones, alſo known to them;—likewiſe the hatching of chickens without incubation.—Of the art of muſic:—It was practiſed in Egypt for the beſt purpoſes:—As it was practiſed there, it was alſo there invented.—The practice of it very antient in Egypt.—It was invented under the Dæmon Kings,—and was preſerved with the greateſt care, and no innovation of it ſuffered.—For this purpoſe, there muſt have been a notation of it.—An art of muſic of very difficult invention, being the application of numbers to the tones of the human voice or of inſtruments,—a ſhort account given of the difficulty of the invention.—It could only have been invented in a country ſuch as Egypt, where arts and ſciences were cultivated.—The Greek muſic no better than the muſic of the Hurons, till Pythagoras brought the art into Greece from Egypt.—From thence they only got the Diatonic Scale.—To this they added the Chromatic and the Enharmonic.—This refinement of muſic not ſo proper for the uſeful purpoſes to which the Egyptians applied it.—The Greeks had alſo modes of muſic, ſuch as the Dorian, the Phrygian, and Lydian.—The writing art more connected with language than muſic.—It is laungnage not pronounced.—A wonderful art, by which ſounds are made viſible,—a progreſs

in

in the writing art as in every other.—At firſt, the ideas were directly repreſented, by figures natural or ſymbolical.—Theſe laſt were what is called Hieroglyphics.—Of the aſſiſtance given to our intellect by our ſenſes, and how wonderfully the two concur to carry on man in the purſuit of knowledge.—The advantages of the writing art.—This art invented in Egypt by a Dæmon, called Theuth. —But he invented only the notation of the elemental ſounds by written characters.—The analyſis of language, into elemental ſounds, was before his time, under the Dæmon Kings.

IN the preceeding chapter I have given a pretty full account of the country of Egypt and the people, and particularly of their government, of which I have ſaid a great deal, I hope the reader will not think too much, as it is a thing ſo eſſential in the hiſtory of man, that without it there could have been no civil ſociety, nor conſequently any progreſs made by man in this life towards a better in the world to come. I go on now with what is the proper ſubject of this book,—the origin of arts and ſciences. Of one of theſe, and that without which other arts and ſciences never could have been invented, and of which, therefore, I have treated at ſo great length, I mean the laſt mentioned art of government, I think it is evident, that Egypt muſt have been the parent country; for, as it was the oldeſt civilized country, they could not have borrowed the art from any other, and therefore they muſt have invented it themſelves; and, I think, I have ſhown, that they not only invented it, but brought it to the greateſt perfection. In the preceeding chapters I have treated of other arts, which they invented, particularly the art of agriculture; and, I think, I have ſhown that we owe to them the bread we eat, and the wine and the ale we drink. I think I have alſo ſhown, that we owe to them the clothes we wear,

and

and that we have been alſo taught by them to make that artificial defence againſt the weather, which we call a *houſe*, inſtead of thoſe rocks and caves which were the only protection that men had againſt the injuries of the weather in the natural ſtate. And in this way, I think, I have ſhown, that the Egyptians were the inventors of all the neceſſary arts of life in the civilized ſtate. And if I can further prove that they were the inventors of language, without which no other art could have been invented, I think I ſhall have proved, what I have frequently thrown out in the courſe of this work, that Egypt was the parent country of all arts and ſciences, and even of civil ſociety itſelf, which could not have been formed or carried on without the uſe of language. For the purpoſe of agriculture and building, metallurgy was neceſſary. The Egyptians, therefore, firſt taught men to dig into the bowels of the earth, and from thence to bring forth metals. But theſe could have been of little or no uſe without the uſe of fire, a thing, as I have ſhown *, unknown to nations who are ſo far advanced in the civil life, as to have got the uſe of ſpeech. Of this ſo uſeful invention, therefore, we muſt give the honour to the Egyptians. And there was one uſe of fire, which was unknown to the Greeks and Romans, but was practiſed in Egypt, I mean the making of glaſs; for Maillet, the French Conſul in Egypt, in the account he has given us of that country, tells us, that he has ſeen windows of glaſs in ſome caſes of mummies. We owe, therefore, likewiſe to the Egyptians this invention, which in modern times has been of ſo much uſe and ornament to us. And the ſame Maillet tells us, that there has been found, in the caſes of ſome mummies, pieces of glaſs coloured, reſembling precious ſtones, like the French paſte. And there is the art of hatching chickens and other fowls in ovens without the incubation of the females, which was diſcovered in Egypt, as Diodorus

* Page 146. of this vol.

us Siculus informs us *, and which, as he obſerves, muſt have multiplied very much the breed of fowls. This ſecret is known in Europe, and has been practiſed by way of curioſity, but, as travellers informs us, is ſtill a common practice in Egypt.

Hitherto, the arts I have mentioned, invented in Egypt, are arts of uſe, ſome of them of the greateſt uſe, ſuch as agriculture and the other arts connected with it; others of them arts of convenience, and ſome of ornament merely. But I am now to proceed to ſpeak of an art of abſolute neceſſity in the civilized life, without which there could have been no civility, nor any arts invented worth mentioning. By this deſcription the reader will underſtand, that I mean language; which, I ſay, was invented in Egypt, and formed into an art there, as well as the other arts I have mentioned. But, before I come to ſpeak of it, I will mention another art, which is one of the fineſt of the liberal arts, being that which gives us the greateſt pleaſure, and which, if properly applied, may be made highly uſeful. The art I mean is muſic. This art, as I have ſhown, is ſo much connected with language, that there cannot be a perfect language, which is not more or leſs muſical †; and, therefore, it is not improper to ſpeak of the invention of it, before I come to ſpeak of the invention of language.

That this art was practiſed in Egypt, and for a very good purpoſe,—the inſpiring ſentiments of devotion, as I have obſerved elſewhere‡, is a fact that cannot be diſputed, being atteſted both by Herodotus and Plato. And Plato, in the paſſage I have quoted from him, ſays‖, that it was employed for another excellent purpoſe, the

* Lib. 1. cap. 61.

† Page 117.

‡ See p. 167. and 168.

‖ Ibid.

forming the manners of the youth. Now, as it was an art practiſed in Egypt, I ſay it was invented there, as well as the other arts I have mentioned. For Herodotus tells us, that they borrowed nothing from other countries; and, indeed, there was no other country in thoſe antient times, from which they could have got any art ſuch as that of muſic; which was an art of very antient practice in Egypt. And the invention of it goes back to their Dæmon Kings: For Plato tells us, that they had ſongs of Iſis, which were 10,000 years old; and of this ſo antient muſic no alteration, he tells us, was permitted. It is evident, therefore, that as early as the days of Iſis, muſic in Egypt muſt have been reduced to an art; and not practiſed, as we know it is in barbarous countries, without any art at all; for otherwiſe, I think, it could not have been preſerved with ſo much accuracy. And, I think, it is highly probable, that they had a notation of muſic as well as we have; without which it could not well have been preſerved ſo religiouſly (as we muſt ſuppoſe it was) in the memories and voices of men for ſuch a prodigious number of years.

That men have naturally a perception of the difference of *acute* and *grave* in ſounds, and that they can make that diſtinction by their own voices, is a fact which cannot be diſputed. But I do not for that ſay, that men naturally ſing, that is to ſay, compoſe acute and grave ſounds together, ſo as to make what we call a *tune;* but this, I ſay, they learnt by imitation of birds, (man being, as Ariſtotle has told us, the moſt imitative of all animals, and particularly by the voice). And this was confirmed to me by the Wild Girl I ſaw in France, who told me that the people in her country learnt to ſing in that way. But the practice in every art precedes the art: And therefore I am perſuaded, that men ſung a great while, in the way I have mentioned, before they had any art of muſic.

Before

Before ſuch an art could be invented, the tune or ſong muſt firſt be analyſed into its elementary notes; and then we muſt diſcover what the ratio is of thoſe notes to one another; that is in other words we muſt apply arithmetic and the doctrine of ratios to the different tones of the human voice, or of any inſtrument of muſic. To do this, and likewiſe to make the analyſis, which muſt neceſſarily precede it, muſt appear, at firſt ſight, a matter of great art and ſcience. But even this is not all; for as the acute notes riſe above the grave in an infinite progreſſion, to which nature has ſet no bounds, in the ſame manner as numbers increaſe *in infinitum*, it was the buſineſs of ſcience to ſet bounds to infinity in this as well as in other things. And this it has done by ſtopping at what is called the octave, (that is when the acute note is to the grave, as *two* to *one*, which is the firſt multiple ratio), and making it a new fundamental, and from it counting upwards as we did from the firſt fundamental, and ſo going on from one octave to another: In the ſame manner as in numeration we go on till we come to the decade, and there we ſtop, and reckon from it, as we did from unity, ſaying 10 and 1, 10 and 2, &c.; and ſo we go on till we come to another decade; and in this manner we reckon, proceeding, from decade to decade, to numbers, which we denominate by the names of hundreds, that is, ten decades; and then from hundreds to thouſands, which are compoſed of ten hundreds; and ſo on. To explain ſuch a progreſſion at more length, in the matter of muſic, does not belong to a work of this kind. But, I think, I have ſaid enough to ſhow, that muſic could not be reduced to an art, and what is called a gamut, or ſcale of muſic, formed, except in a country ſuch as Egypt, where there was a body of the beſt men of the nation ſet apart for the cultivation of arts and ſciences, and where ſo many other arts and ſciences were diſcovered.

The muſic of the Greeks, while they were yet barbarians, roſe no higher than the muſic of the Hurons in North America, that is to a

fourth. And, I am perſuaded, they knew not any more than the Hurons, what a fourth was, viz. that it was, with reſpect to the fundamental, in the ratio of *three* to *four*. It is a fact not diſputed, that it was Pythagoras who taught them to raiſe their muſic to an octave; and, I cannot doubt of his having brought that diſcovery with him, as well as many others, from Egypt, where he was 22 years. At the ſame time, I am perſuaded, that he gave them a ſcale of muſic, and taught them the ratios that the ſeveral notes bear to one another. And thus the Greeks learned the Diatonic ſcale of muſic, which, I am perſuaded, was at firſt their only muſic; as I believe there was no other at any time known in Egypt. But the Greeks, though they got from Egypt not only the neceſſary arts of life, but the elements alſo of the liberal arts, ſuch as painting and ſtatuary, and of muſic among the reſt, having, as I have elſewhere obſerved, a genius peculiarly ſuited to thoſe arts, made refinements and improvements upon them, and particularly with reſpect to muſic; for they added to the Diatonic ſcale, by which the tone was only divided into two parts, or ſemitones, a ſcale, which they called *Chromatic*, by which the tone was divided into three parts; and, not ſtopping there, they added another they called the *Enharmonic*, by which the tone was divided into four parts. By theſe refinements, their muſic was no doubt more ſoft and delicate, and more proper for pleaſing the delicate ear of the Greeks, but not ſo proper for the purpoſes to which the Egyptians applied their muſic—Devotion, and the inſtruction of youth. For theſe purpoſes the muſic muſt be ſuch that it can be eaſily apprehended by the vulgar and even by children: Whereas the refinements, the Greeks made upon muſic, were ſuch, that even thoſe who had ſtudied the art among them, denied, or at leaſt doubted, that ſuch a note, as the fourth part of a tone, could be executed by any voice or inſtrument, or could be perceived by the ear; and not content with theſe refinements upon the Egyptian muſic, they added

ed what they called *modes*, ſuch as the Dorian, Phrygian, and Lydian.

Before I come to ſpeak of the invention of language, I will mention another art, which has a much greater connection with language than muſic; for it is language itſelf, only in a different form, not being pronounced as language is. The art I mean is the writing art, which, though it was invented in order of time after language, yet, is ſo connected with that art, that I think it leads to the diſcovery of the invention of language. By language, as I have ſaid, our ideas are made audible: But by the writing art they are made viſible; not directly and immediately, but by the intervention of the ſounds of the words which are marked by certain characters, that are perceived by the ſight. As there muſt have been a progreſs in all the arts, the writing art began by making the ideas themſelves an object of ſight, directly and immediately, without the intervention of the ſounds by which they are expreſſed. The firſt writing, therefore, was a kind of painting, whereby the ſubject of the idea was repreſented as it really exiſted. In this way the Mexicans wrote when the Spaniards firſt came among them; and I am perſuaded this was the firſt writing in Egypt. But ſuch writing could only repreſent corporeal objects, which had form and figure that could be painted; but could not repreſent things immaterial, ſuch as the thoughts of men, their ſentiments and paſſions. This could only be done by figurative, or ſymbolical repreſentations of ſuch things: And we are ſure that this was practiſed in Egypt, as there are many remains of it in that country to be ſeen at this day; and it was uſed in ſacred things even after the alphabetical writing was introduced, and from thence it was called hieroglyphical writing.

And here the reader may obſerve, how wonderfully our intellectual part is connected with our ſenſitive. From our ſenſes all our knowledg-

knowledge in this life is derived; for they furniſh the materials of which our ideas are compoſed. But, as of our ideas no art or ſcience could have been formed without the communication of thoſe ideas to one another, our ſenſes have likewiſe furniſhed the means of that communication; firſt by language, by which our ideas are made audible; and ſecondly by writing, by which they are at firſt made viſible by pictures and ſymbols; and then by that wonderful art, by which the ſounds of the words expreſſing the ideas, are made viſible; and ſo the ideas are conveyed, not only to the abſent, at the greateſt diſtance, but to the lateſt poſterity, and with the ideas the language in which they are expreſſed. And in this way the progreſs of *man* in this life towards a better, has been wonderfully promoted; and to this progreſs, as we have ſeen, both his intellect and his ſenſes have concurred, and aſſiſted one another.—But to return to the writing art.

That this wonderful art of alphabetical writing, by which not ideas only were made viſible, which is the caſe of hieroglyphical writing, but, what is much more wonderful, the ſounds by which ideas are expreſſed, were invented in Egypt, I think there can be no doubt, if Plato had not told us ſo in more than one place *. Before an alphabet could be invented, the language muſt have been analyſed into its elemental ſounds. Now, analyſis is a great work of ſcience, and indeed the foundation of all ſcience; ſo that this analyſis could not have been made, but in a country where arts and ſciences were cultivated, which, in thoſe antient times, was only in Egypt. Plato, in the firſt paſſage above quoted, tells us, that an Egyptian, he calls Theuth, was the inventor of letters: But I believe it was of letters only; for I am perſuaded, that before his time, the art of language in Egypt was perfected, at leaſt ſo far, that the words were analyſed into their elemental ſounds: For as no arts or ſciences

* See vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 24. and 229.

ces of any value, can be invented or cultivated without a language of art, I am perſuaded, that ſuch a language was a very early invention in Egypt, as early as their firſt race of Dæmon Kings, of which Theuth was not, but only of the ſecond. And, I think, the anſwer which Plato has mentioned, that the Egyptian King made to Theuth, when he boaſted that he had found out an art of memory, implies that he had only invented the characters, by which the elemental ſounds were marked, not the elemental ſounds themſelves. For, ſays the King, you have not invented an art of memory, but of reminiſcence *. Now, that could not apply to the diſcovery of the elemental ſounds, but only to the notation of them in writing †. But ſuppoſing that Theuth had diſcovered nothing more, it was a wonderful diſcovery, as there could have been no writing art, without inventing marks for thoſe elemental ſounds. And of what wonderful uſe this invention was, we may judge, by comparing our writing with the Chineſe. The Chineſe, in order to expreſs their ideas by writing, are obliged to make uſe of 80,000 figures of one kind or another; which to know and diſtinguiſh from one another, is the labour of the life of their learned men: Whereas we expreſs all our ideas in writing by 24 letters or alphabetical characters, by which we not only communicate the ideas, but the ſounds, that is the language, by which they are expreſſed; while the Chineſe characters communicate only the ideas, but not the language; ſo that ſome nations in their neighbourhood uſe their written language, but know nothing of their oral.

CHAP.

* Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 24. and 25.

† See what I have ſaid upon the difference betwixt the two diſcoveries, ibid. p. 256. and following.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the difficulty of the invention of Language.—The forming of Ideas, neceſſarily previous to the invention of Language; as there can be no Language, which has only names for individual things.—Of the difference betwixt Particular and General Ideas.—Abſtract and General Ideas not the ſame.—Of the material part of Language, Articulation;—of wonderful difficult invention.—Nature has furniſhed the materials, with which other arts work; but we have created the materials of Language.—Wonderful, that we ſhould have learned to articulate by any practice.—Speaking the moſt wonderful thing among Men.—As Men ſpeak by imitation, they muſt have been taught to ſpeak.—This could not be done by Men ſuch as we,—but they muſt have had ſupernatural aſſiſtance, and been taught by Dæmons.—A Language of Art could not have been formed without Men having made ſome progreſs in other Arts and Sciences.—This could not be without ſome kind of Language being uſed before a Language of Art was formed.—The formal part of Language, a moſt wonderful part of the Art.—There muſt be words in a Language of Art, to expreſs every thing in the World of Nature and the World of Art, Immaterial things as well as Material.—Each individual thing impoſſible to be expreſſed,—only the ſpecieſes of them can be expreſſed.—Theſe ſo many, that they could not be all expreſſed by words unconnected with one another.—But they are connected together by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.—Of theſe three, the greateſt Art is Flection.—*An example of the Art of it in the Verb.—To a Language that is perfect is joined the pleaſant Art of Muſic, conſiſting of Melody and*

and Rhythm.—This common to ſeveral of the Antient Languages, and to ſome Modern Languages.—Of the difference betwixt the Muſic of the Chineſe Language and that of the Greek.—The one is Chanting or Singing; the other a fine Melodious flow, ſuitable to Language, and quite different from common Muſic.—Language thus ſhown to be a moſt beautiful as well as uſeful art, and of the greateſt extent, variety, and, at the ſame time, regularity.

THE analyſis of language into its elemental ſounds, naturally leads me to ſpeak of the invention of language itſelf; a moſt curious and wonderful art, as well as a moſt uſeful one, being the parent of all other arts and of all ſciences, and, at the ſame time, of moſt difficult invention. Of the difficulty of the invention, I have ſaid a good deal in the firſt chapter of this ſecond book; but, I will add ſomething more here, as language is the moſt important part of the ſubject of this book, which is the hiſtory of the invention of arts and ſciences.

The invention of language is neceſſarily connected with another moſt important part of the hiſtory of man, ſo important, that without it, he could not have been a man at all, that is, an intellectual creature. What I mean is the Ideas of things, which he forms from the objects of ſenſe; for, as I have more than once obſerved in the courſe of this work, our ſenſes are the inlets of all our knowledge in this life. Ideas are ſo eſſential to language, that without them there could be no language at all; for a language, expreſſing only individual objects, could not be called a language. Of ideas, I have treated pretty fully in Chap. VI. and VII. of Book I. of this volume; where I hope I have ſatisfied the reader,—That there are particular ideas as well as general; nor, indeed, can general ideas without particular be conceived to exiſt;—That abſtract ideas are diffe-

rent from general, though they be confounded by our modern philoſophers;—And that an idea muſt be firſt abſtracted from the particular object, in which it exiſts, before it can be generalized.

According to the method in which I have treated language, I have divided it into two parts; which I have conſidered ſeparately, the *matter* and the *form*. The Matter of it is articulate ſounds; and, in this reſpect, if in no other, it muſt appear to the philoſopher the moſt wonderful of all arts: For in other arts, as I have elſewhere obſerved*, nature has furniſhed us with the materials, ſuch as wood, ſtone, and metals; whereas, of language we have ourſelves furniſhed the materials, that is, articulate ſounds, which we may be ſaid to have created. Of articulation I have ſpoken at conſiderable length in the chapter above referred to†; where I have ſhown how complicated an engine our vocal inſtrument is, by which we articulate; ſo complicated, that it is wonderful, that, by any teaching or practice, we ſhould have learned the uſe of it, eſpecially in ſyllables, where ſeveral elemental ſounds are to be enunciated together; as in the word *ſtrength* in Engliſh, in which there are no leſs than eight elemental ſounds, and ſeven of them conſonants‡. The material part of language therefore, I mean the pronunciation of it, I hold to be of ſuch difficulty, that it never could have been invented without ſupernatural aſſiſtance; and, even after it was invented, it could not have been learned by practice, if Man had not been, as Ariſtotle ſays, the moſt imitative of all animals, and more imitative by the voice than in any other way. But, even imitative as he is, ſpeaking, though the moſt common thing among men, is, as I have elſewhere obſerved‖, one of the moſt wonderful.

That

* Page 108. of this vol.

† Chap. 1. of this book.—p. 109. and following.

‡ Page 115. ‖ Page 121.

That men do not ſpeak naturally, but muſt have learned it by teaching or imitation, is evident; and it is as evident, that they could not have taught themſelves, any more than dumb men could teach themſelves. They muſt, therefore, have been taught by others; but theſe others muſt have been firſt taught themſelves. Now, who taught them, ſince they could not teach themſelves? And, I ſay, it was not men ſuch as they were, or ſuch as we are, but ſuperior intelligences, ſuch as the Dæmon Kings of Egypt were. I hold it, therefore, to be certain, that the moſt barbarous languages, and the moſt defective and imperfect in their articulation, were not invented by the nations that ſpeak them, nor by men ſuch as we, but proceeded from ſuperior intelligences. I have ſaid, in other parts of my writings upon language, that men in certain countries may have heard ſuch birds as the *cuckoo* or *cocketoo*, to which the articulation of theſe ſounds is natural, and may have imitated theſe ſounds: This, however, is only poſſible. But it is not at all probable, that hearing thoſe birds only at certain ſeaſons of the year, and then only occaſionally, men ſhould have learned to have imitated theſe ſounds; for it is only by hearing articulate ſounds daily and conſtantly, that we learn to give ſuch a poſition to our organs, and to put them in ſuch an action, as to make us pronounce them. But if it were poſſible, I think it impoſſible, that out of ſuch ſimple articulate ſounds, as the names of thoſe birds, any language, even the moſt imperfect in its articulation, could have been formed. What, therefore, I have all along ſuppoſed, in the courſe of what I have written upon language, that it could not have been invented by men, at leaſt not without ſupernatural aſſiſtance, I hold to be certainly true. And this may ſuffice at preſent, with reſpect to the material part of language.

As to the *formal* part, I think it is evident, that a language of art, of which I am now to ſpeak, could not have been formed except

in a country where arts and ſciences had made conſiderable progreſs. Now, this could not have been without a language however imperfect: For, language is undoubtedly, as I have often ſaid in the courſe of this work, the parent art of all other arts; as it is by it, that men have communication with one another, and, in that way, have invented arts. It is, therefore, I think evident, that men muſt have had a language, however imperfect, by which they were enabled to form a more perfect language. And, this firſt language, I think I have ſhown, muſt have been taught them by ſuperior intelligences; and I alſo think it is very probable, that theſe ſame intelligences may have aſſiſted them in the formation of a language of art.

The *formal* part of language conſiders words as ſignificant. And here the art, when it paſſes from ſounds to things, enlarges itſelf wonderfully, and is as extenſive as our ideas; for a perfect language muſt expreſs by words every thing, of which men living in civil ſociety and cultivating arts and ſciences, can have any idea. Now, theſe are all the things in the heavens above, on the earth below, and even the things under the earth and in the air or waters, which are perceived by our ſenſes: And beſides theſe natural objects, there are all the artificial works of men, which, in their intercourſe in civil ſociety, muſt likewiſe be expreſſed by words. So that language muſt comprehend the two worlds, of which I have ſpoken elſewhere *, the world of nature and the world of art. And not only muſt it expreſs material things, but things immaterial, ſuch as mind and the ſeveral kinds of it, the intellectual, animal, and vegetable, and their different qualities and operations. And at the ſame time that it expreſſes the *ſubſtances* of the ſeveral kinds I have mentioned, it muſt alſo expreſs their *accidents*, and their relations and connections with one another. Now, to expreſs each individual of ſuch an infinity of things, by a diſtinct word, is a thing by nature impoſſible,

* Page 22.

ble, at leaſt for an animal of ſuch limited capacity as man is. It is, therefore, only the ſpecieſes of things, that we can denote by words. How many of theſe are in number has not yet been aſcertained: And all that ſcience hitherto has been able to do in that matter, is to reduce them to genuſes of the higheſt order, and in that way to claſs and number them; which, as I have ſhown*, was a very great work of ſcience, the greateſt perhaps that ever was performed. But, even as to the ſpecieſes, they are ſo many, that hitherto they have never been numbered, nor I believe ever will. The grammatical art, however, has reduced them to certain general heads, which it calls *parts of ſpeech*, and has made them eight in number. Theſe, I have obſerved, may be called the categories of language; and they admit of the ſame general diviſion into ſubſtance and accident †. The ſpecieſes of things comprehended under the parts of ſpeech, though they never have been numbered, we are ſure, are ſo many, that, if they were to be all denoted by diſtinct words, unconnected with one another, there is no memory that could comprehend them, ſo as to make a ready uſe of them. It was, therefore, of abſolute neceſſity that ſome way ſhould be contrived, by which, in a language of art, the words uſed to expreſs ſo very many different things, which in the Latin language amount to no leſs than five millions ‡, ſhould be ſo connected together, that they may be comprehended in the memory, and readily applied to uſe. This wonderful work is performed by the three great arts of language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection, by which the words are ſo connected together, both in ſound and ſenſe, that the knowledge of one naturally leads to the knowledge of another. Of theſe three, flection, as I have elſewhere obſerved ‖, is the greateſt art; for without making a new

* Page 76. of this vol.
† Page 118. ibid.
‡ Page 119. ibid.
‖ Page 126. ibid.

new word, which is done by derivation and compoſition, it expreſſes by ſome ſmall changes very many circumſtances belonging to the thing expreſſed by the word, and which otherwiſe muſt have been expreſſed by different words. Of this great art of language the verb is a remarkable example; for, by certain changes of the word, it expreſſes *numbers*, *perſons*, *times*, and beſides all theſe, *the diſpoſitions of the human mind with reſpect to the action of the verb**; and it alſo expreſſes whether the action be *done* or *ſuffered*. To expreſs, by any flection or change of the word, all the various ſubjects of the action of the verb, is by nature impoſſible. But the art of the Greek language has gone ſo far, (and I think it was impoſſible that it could go farther), as to expreſs, in that way, the ſubject of the action, when it happens to be the ſame with the actor. This is done by what is called the *middle voice* in Greek †. In ſhort, the verb in that language is ſo wonderful a piece of art, that I knew a Profeſſor of Divinity who could not believe that it was the invention of man, but had come down from heaven ready made.

Flection, too, in a language of art, is of the greateſt uſe in that moſt important part of grammar, called *ſyntax;* and which is the completion of the grammatical art; being that, without which, the other parts of the art would ſignify nothing, as by it the words are ſo connected together as to make ſpeech or diſcourſe ‡.

But the art of a perfect language does not confine itſelf to articulate ſounds, nor even to the variety of things expreſſed by thoſe ſounds; but it joins to the moſt uſeful art among men, the moſt pleaſant art; I mean muſic. By this the reader will underſtand, that

* Page 119.

† See further concerning the wonderful variety of the flection of the verb, p. 119.

‡ Page 119.—120.

that I mean melody and rhythm, ſuch as that of the Greek language; of which I have ſpoken at great length in the ſecond volume of the Origin of Language *. But it was not peculiar to the Greek language, but common to all the antient languages of art, ſuch as the Latin, and a language much more antient than either the Greek or Latin; I mean the antient language of Egypt, which was carried to India, as I ſhall ſhow in the ſequel of this work, where it is ſtill preſerved in the Shanſcrit language. It was alſo in the Hebrew language: And it found its way acroſs the Atlantic to North America; where the ſavages, as we call them, at this day ſpeak both with melody and rhythm †. The Chineſe language is ſo much a muſical language, that it is by muſical tones chiefly that it diſtinguiſhes the ſignifications of its monoſyllables; ſo that, by words not exceeding 330 in number, it has contrived to expreſs all the things belonging to a life of civility and art. But there is this material difference betwixt the muſic of the Chineſe and of the Greek language, that the tones in the Chineſe riſe or fall above or below one another, at once, as in the common muſic, ſo that the intervals betwixt them are perceptible by the ear; which makes their ſpeaking very much reſemble chanting or ſinging: Whereas the melody of the Greek language proceeds by ſlides, riſing in that way to a *fifth*, and deſcending in the ſame way to the common level of ſpeech; which muſt have given to the pronunciation of that language a moſt beautiful flow, ſuitable to the nature of language, and diſtinguiſhing the muſic of it from common muſic. Beſides theſe advantages, which the muſic of the Greek language has over the Chineſe, it has rhythm and the diſtinction of long and ſhort ſyllables, of which I could obſerve little or nothing in what I heard ſpoken of the Chineſe:

* Book 2. chap. 4. 5. & 6.

† See upon the ſubject of the muſic of language, p. 117. and the paſſages there referred to.—As to the melody of the languages of America, ſee vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 132.

neſe: And, I am ſure, that their notes do not riſe ſo high as a fifth; ſo that the intervals of ſo many different tones, by which they diſtinguiſh the ſignification of their monoſyllables, muſt be very ſmall, and make a muſic of little variety, and which cannot be performed, except by a very good voice, nor apprehended, except by a very nice ear. It appears, therefore, to be a language neither ſo pleaſant, as the Greek, nor ſo fit for common uſe. And, *laſtly*, the muſic of the Chineſe language does not appear to be governed by any rules; whereas the melody of the Greek language is, as well as every thing elſe in that language, governed by rules, which are explained at great length by ſome Greek grammarians, particularly by Theodorus Gaza in his grammar.

Thus, I think, I have ſhown, that a language of art, ſuch as the Greek, is not only a moſt uſeful, but a moſt beautiful art, and of the greateſt extent and variety; comprehending all nature and art, and the immaterial as well as the material world, as far as the uſe of ſpeech goes; and all digeſted in the greateſt order, and with as much regularity as variety. And not only is a language of art the foundation of all other arts, and of all ſciences, but it is intimately connected with another art, of the greateſt importance in human life, being that, by which only a free government can be carried on: I mean the rhetorical art, of which the chief part is *action**,—the firſt, the ſecond, and the third quality of an orator, according to the judgement of Demoſthenes. Now, in action, the chief thing is the management of the voice in pronunciation, which muſt depend, firſt, upon a proper compoſition in ſentences and periods, and then upon the pronunciation of theſe periods:—So that it is language which muſt give to oratory its greateſt force and influence.

CHAP.

* See what I have ſaid of Action, and of the ſeveral things comprehended under that word, in Origin of Language, vol. VI. p. 205. and following.

CHAP. XV.

Reaſons for the Author inſiſting ſo much upon the difficulty of the invention of the Art of Language.—One reaſon is, that it tends to prove, that Language muſt have been invented in Egypt, where ſo many other arts were invented.—Proved, 1mo, *That Language was invented by the Egyptians, by the progreſs they made in other arts and in ſciences, which could not have been without Language.* —2dly, *Articulation could not have been invented without the aſſiſtance of thoſe Dæmon Kings, whom the Egyptians had.*—3tio, *We are ſure that the Egyptians made the firſt ſtep in the invention of an art of Language, by analyſing it into its elemental ſounds.—They did not ſtop at that analyſis, but likewiſe analyſed the words into the parts of ſpeech.—But theſe words at firſt monoſyllabical.—In this ſtate Language went to China, where it remains unimproved, in its original ſtate.—Hieroglyphics went there alſo;—and there they are ſtill preſerved.—In Egypt the art was perfected by the invention of the Alphabet, and of a Polyſyllabical Language, formed by Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.—This compleated the Grammatical Art, and the Art of Language.—The Phænicians the only people that can contend with the Egyptians for the invention of Language.—Sundry reaſons given why they were not the inventors of it.*—1mo, *Their Genius did not lead them that way, being wholly employed in Trade, and ſtudious only of Gain.*—2dly, *They had no Polity fit for the invention or cultivation of arts.*—3tio, *They lived, in antient times, in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians, and ſo may be ſuppoſed to have got Language and other arts from them.* —4to, *They had their Religion from Egypt.—This proved by ſun-*

dry facts.—The Egyptians, therefore, the inventors, and the only inventors of Language.—How Language and other arts were tranſmitted from Egypt to other Countries, is an important part of the Hiſtory of Man.—This to be treated of in the following Book.

IN the preceeding chapter, and other parts of this work, I have been at great pains to ſhow the difficulty of the invention of language; and this for ſeveral reaſons. *Firſt*, it is an art of ſo common uſe, (much more common than any other art among men), and, in appearance of ſuch eaſy uſe, being practiſed by men, women, and children, that ſome believe it to be natural to men, and among others a great writer, of whom I have made already a good deal of uſe, and ſhall make more in the ſequel of this work;—Mon. Gebelin, author of the *Monde Primitif*, who believes that there exiſted a natural language among men, from which all the languages now ſpoken are derived.

My *ſecond* reaſon is, That as language is the parent of all other arts, without which no other art or ſcience could have been invented, and conſequently man muſt have remained in his fallen ſtate, that is an animal, with only the capacity of intellect, ſo that he could have made no progreſs in this life towards the recovery of his former ſtate, it was proper that every thing concerning this art ſhould be fully explained, particularly the difficulty of the invention of it; which I think I have ſhown to be ſo great, that it never could have been invented, if a wiſe and good God had not interpoſed to aſſiſt man in this firſt ſtep of his progreſs.

My *third* reaſon is, that it tends to prove, what is to be the ſubject of this chapter, that the art muſt have been invented in Egypt, where ſo many other arts were invented, and particularly muſic, (an art, as I have

have ſhown, connected with language), which, though very much more natural to man than language, as Nature furniſhes him the materials of which it is made, (and, therefore, it is practiſed by the moſt barbarous nations), was not formed into an art, except in Egypt, where a moſt curious analyſis was made of it into notes, to which, as I have ſhown, numbers were applied in order to ſhow the diſtinction of them, and their relation to one another. And another art was likewiſe invented in Egypt, which has ſtill a cloſer connection with language; I mean the writing art, of the invention of which, I have treated in a preceding chapter *.

That in a country where ſo many other arts were invented, and theſe not ſo neceſſary as language, this moſt neceſſary of all arts, ſhould have been invented, muſt appear at firſt ſight highly probable. And if we conſider, that the Egyptians, as Herodotus ſays, borrowed nothing from any other country, it is not only probable, but of abſolute neceſſity, that they ſhould have invented an art of language, without which, they could have invented no other art; for, as I have obſerved in more than one place, in the courſe of this work, it was only by the intercourſe and communication with one another, which language affords, that men could have invented any other art.

But farther, I think I have ſhown, that the *matter* of language, I mean articulation, could not have been invented without ſupernatural aſſiſtance, which the Egyptians had from their Dæmon Kings. Now, without articulation no language can exiſt, not even the rudeſt and moſt inartificial. But it is farther proved, that the Egyptians made one great ſtep in forming an art of language; and that was by analyſing it into its elemental ſounds, and ſo making an alphabet; which, though it be the firſt thing that our children are

* Cap. 13. of this book.

taught, and therefore may be ſuppoſed to be as eaſily invented as taught, yet the contrary of this is proved to be the truth, by the example of barbarous nations, who have not ſtudied language as an art; and though they have the ready uſe of it, both in converſation and public ſpeaking, nevertheleſs, have not ſo much as the idea of an alphabet.

The Egyptians having gone ſo far in the invention of an art of language, as to have analyſed the ſound of it into its firſt elements, we cannot ſuppoſe that they would ſtop there, but would proceed to the analyſis of the ſounds conſidered as ſignificant, that is, the words, and ſo diſcover what we call *the parts of ſpeech.*

But even after that was done, the art of language was not compleat; for there muſt be a progreſs in all the arts, and particularly in an art of ſo difficult invention as that of language; in the invention of which though ſupernatural aſſiſtance was given, yet it was neceſſary that things ſhould proceed according to that order and regularity, by which every thing in this univerſe is conducted. In the natural order, therefore, of things, the firſt words, which men learned to articulate, were monoſyllables; and it would be only in proceſs of time, that they would learn to join monoſyllables together, into words of ſeveral ſyllables. The firſt language, therefore, which was ſpoken in Egypt, was a monoſyllabical language, which came to China through India, together with their hieroglyphical writing; and they are both preſerved in China to this day*. But among the Egyptians, a people much more ingenious than the Chineſe, an art of writing by alphabetical characters, was, as we have ſeen, invented, and alſo a polyſyllabical language; the conſequence of which laſt invention was the diſcovery and the practice of the three great arts of language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection.

In

* See vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 141. and following, alſo p. 108.

In this way the grammatical art in Egypt was compleated; and the language by the labours of the colleges of Prieſts, men ſet apart for the invention and cultivation of arts, was brought to that perfection, in which we ſee it is in the Shanſcrit, preſerved ſtill among the Prieſts of India, and which, as I ſhall ſhow in the ſequel, was the antient language of Egypt.

The only people I ever heard mentioned, that might have invented a language, as well as the Egyptians, are the Phœnicians; a very antient people undoubtedly, and who were very early poſſeſſed of arts and civility, and particularly of the art of navigation, by which they carried their commerce to very remote parts of the world. But, in the *firſt* place, the Phœnicians had no ſupernatural aſſiſtance by Dæmons, ſuch as were among the Egyptians, without which, I think I have ſhown, it was impoſſible that men could have invented articulation.

2*dly*, I ſay that the genius of this people did not incline them to invent or cultivate arts and ſciences; but that they were, as Diodorus informs us*, from the moſt antient times, ſtudious of gain; for which purpoſe they applied themſelves to trade, and were the greateſt navigators of antient times. Among ſuch a people, I think, it is impoſſible, that an art of more difficult invention than any other ſhould have been diſcovered. And though they had a genius fitted for ſuch an invention, they had no polity or conſtitution of government, like the Egyptian, ſuited for the invention and cultivation of arts.

3*tio*, They lived in antient times, as Herodotus informs us †, upon the Red Sea, in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians; ſo that what

* Lib. 5. cap. 38.

† Lib. 7. cap. 89.

what arts they had, they may have got from the Egyptians, and among others, the art of language. That they were intimately connected with the Egyptians, and had adopted many of their cuſtoms and manners, and particularly their religious cuſtoms, is evident from ſundry facts recorded of them; particularly Porphyry tells us, in his book *De Abſtinentia* *, that they had the ſame veneration for the Cow that the Egyptians had, and would not on any account eat of her fleſh. *2dly*, Herodotus informs us †, that the image which the Phœnicians had upon the prow of their galleys, and which they called Παταϊκος, was very like to the ſtatue of Vulcan in Egypt. Now, this ſo great reſemblance could not have been accidental; and the probability is, that they had taken from Egypt this tutelary god of their veſſels. *3dly*, In Tyre, the capital of Phœnicia, there was, as Herodotus informs us, a temple of Hercules, as old as the city; that is, 2300 years old, in the days of Herodotus, and which, therefore, muſt have been of the Egyptian Hercules, as the ſame author rightly concludes; and in the ſame paſſage he tells us, that the Phœnicians built a temple to Hercules in Thaſus, a colony of theirs, five generations before the ſon of Amphytrion ‡. And, *laſtly*, we are told by Jamblichus, in his life of Pythagoras ‖, that the Hierophants and Myſtagogues of Biblos and Tyre got all their religion and philoſophy from the Egyptians. It is, therefore, evident, that the Phœnicians had their religion and myſteries from Egypt; and if ſo, I think, we may conclude, that they had their language and other arts from the ſame country.

Thus I think I have ſhown, that language was invented in Egypt, and in no other country; for, if it was not invented by the Phœnicians,

* Lib. 2. cap. 11.

† Lib. 3.

‡ Lib. 2. cap. 44.

‖ Cap. 3.

ans, as I think I have proved it was not, there was no other people at that time that could have invented it; for as to the Babylonians, and their Prieſts the Chaldæans, it is well known, to thoſe who have ſtudied antient hiſtory, that they were a colony of the Egyptians.

But it will be ſaid, ſuppoſing the Egyptians were the inventors, and the only inventors of language, and that the antient Egyptian language was that primitive language, from which all the other languages of the world have been derived, how ſhould this language have come from Egypt to all the other countries of the world? This is no doubt a matter which deſerves mature conſideration; and as the tranſmiſſion of arts and ſciences, and particularly of the parent art, language, from one country to another, is a very important part of the hiſtory of man, I intend it for the ſubject of another book, which will conclude the hiſtory I have undertaken to give, of arts and ſciences.

BOOK

BOOK III.

Of the Tranſmiſſion of Arts and Sciences from Egypt to other Countries.

CHAP. I.

Egypt ſo ſituated as to be fit for communicating its Arts to many countries of the Earth.—It communicated by land with Africa and Aſia.—In Africa their Arts do not appear to have made any great progreſs.—The Lybians quite a Savage People.—They ſpoke a very barbarous Language, which they may have formed from hearing the Egyptian Language ſpoken.—To Aſia the Egyptian Language and Arts may have been carried by Seſoſtris, who overran even the northern parts of Aſia, and eſtabliſhed a colony at Colchis upon the Euxine Sea.—The Jews learned their Language from Egypt;—but it was a corrupt dialect of the Egyptian which they ſpoke.—This proved from what paſſed in Egypt when Jacob and his family came there.—They learned alſo the writing Art in Egypt, and wrote like the Egyptians from right to left.—From Chaldæa the Egyptian Language proceeded to other parts of Aſia.—The Art of Language, though of more difficult invention than any other Art, is of very eaſy communication.—Of the progreſs of the Egyptian Arts from Egypt to Europe.—Seſoſtris, from Colchis, might have gone

gone by land to Thrace, where he was.—But the eaſier and ſhorter paſſage from Egypt to Europe was by Sea.—Of Navigation the Egyptians had the uſe in the earlieſt times.—The neareſt Iſland in the Mediterranean Sea to Egypt was Crete.—Thither the Egyptian Arts firſt went, being introduced by the Idæi Dactyli *and the* Curetes.—*That Religion came from Egypt to Crete, proved by the Samothracian and Eleuſinian Myſteries, being well known there.—Saturn the firſt King of Crete, being dethroned by his Son Jupiter, carried from thence the Egyptian Arts to Italy, and made a Saturnian age there.—Jupiter ruled in Greece as well as in Crete, —introduced there the Egyptian Arts.—Theſe Arts brought into Greece more directly by Colonies from Egypt.—The neceſſity of Migration from ſo ſmall a Country as Egypt, and ſo populous.—Of the two Colonies which came from Egypt, and formed the nations of Athenians and Arcadians:—Theſe the two moſt antient nations of Greece. —From Arcadia came a Colony under Oenotrus, that ſettled in Italy, and another under Evander.—From Arcadia came the Pelaſgi, who introduced a great deal of Civility and Arts into Greece, particularly the Writing Art:--But the Egyptians carried their arts to a Country very remote, viz. India.--This the ſubject of another Chapter.*

THE firſt thing to be conſidered, in this inquiry concerning the propagation of arts and ſciences from Egypt into other countries, is the ſituation of Egypt with reſpect to theſe other countries. If it had been ſituated any where in the extremities of eaſt or weſt, north or ſouth, it could hardly be ſuppoſed that its arts ſhould have made any great progreſs into other countries. But its ſituation was as favourable for that purpoſe as the other circumſtances that I have mentioned; for it was ſo ſituated as to have an eaſy communication not only with Africa, a part of which it was, but with Aſia and Europe. By land it had a communication with every part of Africa:

But it does not appear that the Egyptian arts made any great progreſs in that country; for the Lybians were in a ſavage ſtate, as late as the time of the Jugurthine war, according to the account which Salluſt the Roman hiſtorian gives of them. They had, however, the uſe of language; though no doubt a very imperfect language, reſembling, as we are told, the cries of bats. But that they got it, even ſuch as it was, from Egypt, I cannot doubt; for, I think, it is impoſſible, to ſuppoſe that a people, ſo barbarous as they, ſhould have invented that artificial way of communication by articulate ſounds. I therefore muſt ſuppoſe, that they learned from the Egyptians, or from ſome other nation who had themſelves learned from the Egyptians, to diſtinguiſh and vary their animal cries by articulation, which when they had learned, they might form a kind of language themſelves, very different to be ſure from a language of art, but ſuch as would ſerve the purpoſes of their ſavage life.

With Aſia likewiſe they had an intercourſe by land: For their King Seſoſtris overran all Aſia, even the northern parts of it, where he left a colony, at Colchis, upon the northern part of the Euxine Sea; and we are told, that he alſo conquered the Scythians.

That in thoſe remote countries of Aſia Seſoſtris introduced ſome of the Egyptian arts, or that they came, from the colony he left at Colchis, to other parts of Aſia, cannot, I think, be doubted: And, even before he overran all Aſia, there is the greateſt probability that ſome of thoſe arts, and particularly language, had come to thoſe countries of Aſia neareſt to Egypt, ſuch as Syria, Chaldæa, and Paleſtine. The Jews are the only people in Aſia, of thoſe early times, of whom we have any account that can be depended on; and, I think, there is evidence, that they had learned their language from Egypt. When Abraham went to Egypt, we muſt ſuppoſe that he could make himſelf underſtood there: Nor could Joſeph

have

have been qualified to govern Egypt, or even the houſehold of Potiphar, if he had not underſtood the Egyptian language. And, when Joſeph's brethren went to Egypt, though Joſeph ſpoke to them by an interpreter *, I think, it is evident, he did ſo, only to conceal himſelf; for they ſpoke to Joſeph's ſteward without an interpreter †; and ſo did Jacob to Pharoah ‡. At the ſame time, I am perſuaded, that the Hebrew, which the family of Jacob then ſpoke, was a corrupt dialect of the language of Egypt; for we know what changes language ſuffers even in the ſame nation, and almoſt always for the worſe. But when a language travels through ſeveral nations, as the Egyptian muſt have done before it reached Chaldæa or Canaan, it muſt have ſuffered great alterations and been much corrupted, not ſo much however as not to be underſtood by Pharoah and the Egyptians; though Joſeph, in order to conceal himſelf, got an interpreter, who ſpoke to his brethren in their own dialect. But, I hold it to have been impoſſible, that the family of Jacob, or any of his predeceſſors, living, as they did, a paſtoral and nomade life, could have invented a language of art, ſuch as the Hebrew was, though not of ſo great art as the Shanſcrit or the Greek, or even could have learned to articulate their animal cries, or to invent a language the moſt rude and barbarous that can be imagined. That the Hebrews had learned the writing art in Egypt, or at leaſt that Moſes had learned it, is evident from what paſſed at Mount *Sinai*; and accordingly the Hebrews wrote, as the Egyptians did, from right to left, not, as we do, from left to right. And as they learned to write, ſo they learned to ſpeak, from Egypt; nor, indeed, was there any other country where they could have learned it. In the ſame manner that the Egyptian language found its way to Chaldæa, I am perſuaded,

* Geneſis, chap. 42. v. 23.

† Ibid. chap. 43. v. 19.

‡ Ibid. chap. 47. v. 8.

ſuaded, it travelled over a great part of Aſia: For, though language be an art of more difficult invention than any other, it is of eaſier communication, as we may know by our own children, who, at the age of two or three, learn to ſpeak by mere imitation without any teaching: Though we need not ſuppoſe, that thoſe nations of Aſia learned the Egyptian language ſo perfectly as our children learn our language; but, that hearing the Egyptian language ſpoken, they got ſome words of it, and having thus learned to articulate, they formed a language of their own, as I have ſaid the Lybians did.

As to Europe, there was nothing to hinder the Egyptian arts from travelling by land from Colchis to Europe; and, beſides, Seſoſtris, as I have obſerved*, carried his arms as far into Europe as Thrace. But the eaſier and ſhorter communication with Europe was by ſea; and as the Egyptians had, in the earlieſt times, the uſe of navigation, we cannot doubt that they went to Europe in that way, and firſt to the Iſland of Crete, which is the part of Europe lying the neareſt to Egypt. From this country it is certain, that the Greeks got their religion, civility, and arts. Theſe were introduced into Crete by two races of men, the Idæi Dactyli, and the Curetes. But where did they learn them? I think it could have been no where elſe than in Egypt; for what other country was there then of civility and arts. And what, I think, is proof poſitive, that thoſe two races of men got religion as well as arts from Egypt, is what Diodorus Siculus tells us, that the Samothracian and Eleuſinian myſteries were perfectly well known in Crete, and communicated, to thoſe who deſired them, freely, and not under any obligation of ſecrecy. Now, that thoſe myſteries came to Greece from Egypt is not doubted; and, indeed, from what other country in the world, at that time, could religious myſteries have come? Saturn was the firſt who appears to have eſtabliſhed a kingdom in Crete, of which he himſelf was the ſovereign;

* Page 239. of this vol.

ſovereign; and, under him, the Cretans enjoyed that happineſs, which men enjoyed in the firſt ages of civility, before vices and crimes,

Et belli rabies et amor ſucceſſit habendi *.

And from Saturn this happy age was called the Saturnian age, and by him was carried to Italy, where he introduced the Egyptian civility and arts; for he was dethroned and expelled from Crete by his ſon Jupiter, and took refuge in a part of Italy, which, from giving ſhelter and concealment to him, was called *Latium*. His ſon Jupiter extended his dominions to Greece, and became a King and a great God there. The Greeks, at that time, appear to have been in a ſtate altogether barbarous, and no better than wild beaſts, and worſe than wild beaſts in one reſpect, that they ate one another †. Jupiter, therefore, by introducing civility and arts among them, may be ſaid to have made men of them; for which reaſon, he was intitled *the father both of gods and men*. But of the Greek gods, and the Cretan traditions concerning them, I have ſaid a great deal more in a diſſertation upon the Antient Hiſtory of Greece, which I have ſubjoined by way of appendix to this volume.

If there were any doubt of religion, civility, and arts, having come from Egypt to Greece by the way of Crete, the colonies, which from Egypt came to Greece, muſt prove, I think inconteſtibly, that the Greeks got civility and arts, not only by the way of Crete, but directly and immediately from Egypt. The Egyptians, living in ſuch a happy climate, in ſo fruitful a country, and under ſo excellent a form of government, muſt, as I have ſhown, have multiplied exceedingly; being free of thoſe vices and diſeaſes, and particularly

* Virgil. Æneid. 8. v. 327.

† See upon this ſubject what I have ſaid on p. 95. and 139. of this vol.

particularly of peſtilential diſeaſes, which, at different times, have gone near to depopulate many countries. As Egypt was, therefore, but a ſmall country, no more than a valley betwixt the Arabian mountains on one ſide, and the Lybian on the other, in ſome parts not above 200 ſtadia broad, that is, about 25 Engliſh miles*, it was of abſolute neceſſity that the country ſhould be overſtocked with people in the courſe of ſo many ages, and, therefore, that it ſhould diſcharge itſelf, by ſending colonies to different parts of the world. Of theſe, Diodorus Siculus tells us, that many were recorded in their ſacred books; but, of which, Diodorus appears to have doubted. But, for my part, I ſee no good reaſon for rejecting the authority of thoſe books in any thing, but particularly in this matter of colonies, which, I think, it was of abſolute neceſſity, that the Egyptians ſhould have ſent out of their country. Now, two of theſe colonies were ſent to Greece in very antient times, and formed the two moſt antient nations of Greece, the Athenians, who boaſted that they were *αυτοχθονες*, or *produced out of their ſoil*, and the Arcadians, who pretended to be older than the moon, *Προσεληνοι*, as they called themſelves†. From this laſt mentioned country, came a colony, under Œnotrus, to Latium in Italy, 17 generations, as the Halicarnaſſian tells us, before the Trojan war; and, at a latter period, another, from the ſame country, came under Evander, and occupied that very ground upon which the city of Rome was built: So that here we have civility and arts again imported from Egypt into Italy. From the ſame country of Arcadia came originally the Pelaſgi, who were a very wandering people; for they went not only from Egypt to Greece, but to Aſia, where they were, as Homer informs us, at the time of the Trojan war, and alſo to Italy. They

* Herodot. Lib. 2. cap. 8.

† Theſe two colonies, from Egypt to Greece, I have mentioned in vol. 5. of Origin of Language, p. 101.; and I have ſpoken of them, at great length, in the firſt vol. of that work, from p. 638. to p. 646. of 2d edition.

They are are ſaid to have civiliſed Greece, more than any other people*: And, among other Egyptian arts, they introduced into Greece the uſe of thoſe antient letters, which from them were called Pelaſgic, and were uſed by the Greeks before they got an alphabet from Cadmus, which they uſed in latter times. But, of theſe migrations from Arcadia I have treated at great length in the appendix above referred to. I will, therefore, in the next chapter, proceed to treat of a migration of the Egyptian arts to a country very much more diſtant than any I have mentioned, I mean India, and which, if it be true, muſt put an end to every doubt, of the Egyptians having carried civility and arts to the other countries I have mentioned.

CHAP.

* See vol. 1. of Origin of Language p. 636. of 2d edition.

CHAP. II.

The ſimilarity of Polity, Cuſtoms, and Manners, between nations ſo remote as Egypt and India, wonderful, and without example,—not to be found even in nations contiguous.—The firſt reſemblance is, in a thing ſingular to both nations,—viz. the diviſion of the people into claſſes, according to their ſeveral occupations.—This diviſion in India, more accurate and minute than in Egypt.—Another ſingularity in which the two nations agree is, the veneration of the Cow.—Of the diviſion of Time into Months and Years;—the ſame in India as it was in Egypt, and is among us.—The diviſion into Weeks not neceſſary for any purpoſes of life, yet obſerved both in India and Egypt.—The days alſo conſecrated to the ſame planets and in the ſame order.—The conformity betwixt the two nations, as to the ſigns of the Zodiac, moſt extraordinary.—Of the Religion of India.—The ſame diſtinction made there, betwixt the Popular Religion of the country and the Religion of Philoſophers.—The fall of man maintained by the Indians, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments,—alſo the doctrine of the tranſmigration of minds, which came originally from Egypt.—The diet and manner of life of the Indians, the ſame as in antient Egypt.—They eat no fleſh, but of the beaſts which they ſacrifice.—They drink no wine or ſtrong liquors; and neither did the Egyptians in very antient times.—The ſame regard for the animal life in India as in Egypt.—The killing of ſome animals was a capital crime in Egypt, and is ſo in India.—There a mulct is impoſed for the killing of any animal, even Tygers.—A reſemblance betwixt the two nations alſo in their feſtivals, and exhibitions on thoſe occaſions.

THE

THE ſimilarity of Polity, Cuſtoms, Manners, and Opinions, in two countries ſo remote from one another as Egypt and India, is ſo great, as not to be parralleled on this earth; and not only in nations ſo diſtant from one another, but not even, I believe, in nations the neareſt to one another. The firſt ſimilarity, I ſhall obſerve, is a ſingularity in the conſtitution of the two nations, ſuch as is not, nor ever was, in any other nation; I mean the diviſion of the people into different claſſes, or *Caſts* as the Indians call them, conſiſting of men of different occupations, who live entirely ſeparated from one another, and do not mix by intermarriages. Of theſe claſſes, in Egypt, I have already treated in page 209, and following, of this volume; where I have followed the diviſion, which Diodorus Siculus has given of them, into *five*, the Prieſts, Soldiers, Huſbandmen, Shepherds, and Handicraftſmen. Braſſey Halhed in his Tranſlation of the Code of Gentoo Laws, which, by the orders of the Eaſt India Company, was compiled by eleven Bramins, and written originally in the Shanſcrit language, makes the number of Caſts in India to be no more than four: The firſt is the Bramins, anſwering exactly to the Prieſts of Egypt; and, therefore, they are ſaid to be the wiſdom of the nation. The military men, or Rajaput race, as they are called, compoſe the ſecond claſs; and ſo far the diviſion of men in India correſponds exactly with the diviſion in Egypt: The third claſs in India is more comprehenſive than the ſame claſs in Egypt; for it comprehends not only the huſbandmen, but the ſhepherds, and alſo thoſe who deal in trade. The fourth claſs is compoſed of the meaneſt of the people, or Souders, as they call them, who practice mechanic arts, and are by Nature deſtined to ſerve and to labour*. But theſe four claſſes are ſubdivided into different caſts, of which, I have been told, there are above 80 †: So that the diviſion of the

* See Mr Halhed's Preface to his Tranſlation, p. 49.

† This information I had from the late Mr Frafer, who wrote the life of Kouli Chan.

people in India appears to be more accurate and minute than it was even in Egypt.

Another ſingularity, in which the two nations agreed, is the veneration of the Cow, which is univerſal all over India. Of this Mr Holwell has treated very fully, in his book upon India*; and has given ſome very good reaſons, why the Indians ſhould have ſuch a reſpect for that animal. How much the Cow was reverenced in Egypt, is very well known; but in no other country, antient or modern, except Egypt and India, there neither is, nor ever was, any extraordinary reſpect paid to that animal. So here is another ſingularity in which the two nations agree, but differ from every other nation antient or modern.

A third thing in which the two nations agree, is a matter of great conſequence in the civiliſed life—the diviſion of time into years and months. In India the diviſion, into years and months, is the ſame as with us; and which, as I have ſhown †, came originally from Egypt to the Romans, and from them to us. But there is a third diviſion of time, not ſo neceſſary as the two I have mentioned, but which is obſerved in India at this day; I mean the diviſion into weeks. This, too, came originally from Egypt, but was not known, till later times, to the Greeks and Romans, as Dion Caſſius informs us; and what is moſt remarkable is, that the ſeveral days of the week are conſecrated to the ſame planets, and in the ſame order as it was among the Egyptians, and is among us; for that it was ſo among the Egyptians, we cannot doubt, as Herodotus tells us, that among them every day was conſecrated to ſome God. In India, therefore, the firſt day of the week is dedicated to the Sun—the ſecond to the Moon—the third to Mars—the fourth to Mercury—the fifth to Jupiter—the ſixth to Venus—and the ſeventh to Saturn, juſt

* Page 73.

† Page 147. of this vol.

juſt as it was among the Romans, and is among us. Now, ſuch a diviſion of time, not neceſſary for diſtinguiſhing ſeaſons, or for any purpoſe of civil life, could not by accident have been adopted by two nations, and much leſs the conſecration of the days to the ſame planets and in the ſame order*.

Another thing, which I think ſtill more remarkable, is, that the Indians divide and diſtinguiſh the ſeveral regions of the Heavens, through which the ſun paſſeth in the courſe of a year, by fixed ſtars, conceived to repreſent certain things here upon earth. Theſe repreſentations are well known by the names of the ſigns of the zodiac; and, as they are altogether fanciful and imaginary, it is impoſſible they could have been hit upon by two nations that had no communication together. Yet, it is as certain, that the ſigns of the zodiac came from Egypt to Greece, and from thence to us, as that they are to be found at this day in certain Pagodas in India.

As to the religion of India, Mr Holwell, who was 30 years in India, and was Preſident for ſome time of the Engliſh Court of Law at Calcutta, and is a man of learning as well as law, and from whom we have learned many curious particulars concerning India, has given us a very full account of it; from which it appears, that the Indians make the ſame diſtinction, which the Egyptians made †, betwixt the religion of the philoſophers and the religion of the people. The Bramins, like the Egyptian Prieſts, are the miniſters of the popular religion, and, at the ſame time, are their philoſophers; and it is from them, no doubt, that Mr Holwell has taken his account of the philoſophical religion of India. He ſays, that in their ſacred book, which he calls

* See what Mr Halhed has ſaid upon this ſubject, in his Tranſlation of the Code of Gentoo Laws, p. 41. See alſo what Mr Holwell, in his book upon India, has ſaid upon the ſame ſubject, p. 117. and ſeq.

† See p. 165. of this vol.

their *Shaſta*, the Unity of God is maintained; at the ſame time they believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as the Egyptian Prieſts did, from whom Plato no doubt learned it: And the Indians have a type of the Trinity, which I do not think improper. It is a triangle inſcribed in a circle *, where we have repreſented the *three* in *one*, and the *one* in *three*. They maintain alſo the Providence of God, and his Government of the world, by inferior ſpirits, particularly by one ſpirit, whom they call *Brama*, from whom, he ſays, the Bramins have their name. In this book is alſo maintained the free will of Man, and his abuſe of that free will by his rebellion againſt God, which produced his fall, as well as that of the Angels, from a happy ſtate to the ſtate he is in at preſent; and this fall of man is alſo a doctrine of Plato, and which, I am perſuaded, he likewiſe learned in Egypt. To his prior happy ſtate, he cannot be reſtored without going through ſeveral ſtages of purgation and purification: So that here we have, laid down, both a pre-exiſtant ſtate of Man, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. In his ſtate of purgation Man paſſes through the body of ſeveral other animals, till he comes into the body of a cow †; and from thence he paſſes again into the body of a man. Now, this doctrine of *Metempſychoſis*, or *Tranſmigration*, was an Egyptian doctrine, as Herodotus informs us, and came from Egypt to Greece, where it was adopted by ſome philoſophers, particularly by Plato. And there is one thing of their popular religion, which they have alſo taken from Egypt; and that is the *Phallos*, which, as Herodotus tells us, was worſhipped and carried about in proceſſions in Egypt: And the ſame adoration is paid to it at this day in the kingdom of Bengal ‡; and I have no doubt, but, by the wiſe men of both countries, it has been conſidered as a type or ſymbol

* La Croze's Chriſtianity of India, p. 294,

† Holwell, p. 50.—51. See alſo Dow's Hiſtory of India concerning Tranſmigration, p. 43.

‡ See Dow's Hiſtory of India.

ſymbol of the creative or productive power of the divinity. And this is likewiſe a ſingularity in the religion of the two countries; for there is no other nation that either has, or ever had, ſuch an object of worſhip, except the Greeks, who certainly got that, as well as the reſt of their religion, from the Egyptians.

Further, the whole diet and manner of life of the Indians appears to be Egyptian; for they live upon vegetables, and kill no beaſts in order to eat them, but only for ſacrifice, which was the practice in Egypt. But, when they ſacrifice, they eat of the victim, as the Egyptians did, and as the Bramins do at this day in India, according to the information I have from Mr Wilkins. As they do not eat fleſh, except, as I have ſaid, when they ſacrifice, neither do they drink any wine or ſtrong liquor of any kind: And, I think, it is probable, that the ſame was the practice of the Egyptians, when they imported civility and arts into India; though, in later times, they altered their manner of life in this reſpect, and drank both wine and beer.

They have the ſame regard for the animal life that the Egyptians had. Among the Egyptians all animals, tame or wild, were ſacred in one diſtrict or another: And where they were ſacred, it was a capital crime to kill any of them willingly; but to kill the *Ibis*, or hawk, willingly or unwillingly, was capital *: And, in like manner, I am perſuaded, the killing of a cow, the moſt ſacred of all the animals among them, and ſacred in every part of Egypt, was capitally puniſhed, though I do not remember that it is mentioned in any author. Among the Indians the killing of a cow is a capital crime; and the killing of any animal tame or wild, even a tyger or a bear, is puniſhable by a fine †: And I have heard one proof of their

* Herod. Lib. 2. cap. 65.

† Code of Gentoo Laws, p. 205. and 238.

their regard for the animal life, which I could not have believed, if it had not been atteſted by more than one gentleman who have been in India. They told me, that, in the town of Bombay, the Hindoos had ſo much concern about the maintainance of what we think a vile and contemptible inſect, and which is very troubleſome to us, I mean the bug, that they hire people to allow themſelves to be fed upon in the night time by that animal. To feed, in this way, with the blood of our own bodies, ſo mean an inſect, is carrying our regard for the animal life much too far: But we in Europe go to the other extreme, and abuſe very much that dominion which God has given us over the animals of this earth, treating even the nobleſt of them, ſuch as the horſe, who is of more uſe and ornament to us than any other, very often in the worſt manner *.

And not only in their religion, government, and manner of life, is there ſuch a conformity with the Egyptians, but alſo in their pleaſures; for, in their feſtivals, they have dramatical repreſentations of their religious myſteries, ſuch as they Egyptians had in what they called their δειχηλη †.

CHAP.

* Holwell, p. 147.

† Ibid. p. 145.

CHAP. III.

The conformity in ſo many particulars, betwixt Egypt and India, could not have been by accident,—nor could each of theſe nations have been the original inventors.—The one muſt have copied from the other.—The queſtion then, which was the original, which the copy?—No third nation, from which thoſe two nations could have taken their inſtitutions and cuſtoms,—ſuch a conformity could not have been produced in the ordinary way of commerce.—The two nations, therefore, muſt have mixed and lived together for ſome time.—The Indians did not go to Egypt.—Therefore the Egyptians came to India.—This proved not by argument only, but by facts;—a particular account given by Diodorus of the expedition to India by Oſiris,—alſo of that of Seſoſtris to the ſame country.—Both theſe expeditions by land.—But Seſoſtris was not the firſt Egyptian King that went to India.—This atteſted not only by the ſacred books of the Egyptians, but by a tradition preſerved among the moſt learned of the Indians.—In that tradition a memorable ſtory preſerved, of Oſiris having ſaved his army from a peſtilential diſeaſe by carrying it to a hill called Μηρος.*—Hence the Greek fable.—Summary of the evidence of Oſiris having gone to India.—Objection to the account of Oſiris's expedition, that Herodotus ſays nothing of it.—This anſwered.—The tradition alſo mentions that Hercules was in India, and clothes and arms him very properly.—The abſurdity of the Greek fable, concerning the cloathing and armour of Hercules.—Memorials of Oſiris in India, to be ſeen in the days of Alexander, and even of Diodorus Siculus.—Strabo did not believe in the expedition of Oſiris.—A reaſon given for that.—The Egyptians could*

not

not go to India to learn civility and arts;—theſe they muſt have had before,—and the Indians muſt have learned them from them.—This proved by monuments of black men, with woolly hair, to be ſeen in India; and alſo in China and Japan.—Proof that the Egyptian Religion, as well as arts, was carried to all the countries of the Eaſt as well as to India.—Language alſo carried from Egypt to India.—a language of art, the work of ſcience and philoſophy; in which analyſis is very much practiſed.

FROM what has been ſaid in the preceding chapter it is evident, that the wonderful conformity betwixt the Egyptian and Indian Polity, Cuſtoms, Manners, and Opinions, could not have happened by accident; and, I think, it is equally certain, that each of the nations could not have been the original inventors of thoſe things, (ſome of them ſingular and unknown to all other nations), but that the one of them muſt have copied them from the other: So that the only queſtion is, Which is the copy, and which the original?

Another thing, I think, is alſo certain, that there was no third nation upon the face of the earth, from which they could have taken thoſe ſingular inſtitutions and cuſtoms. And it likewiſe appears to me to be equally certain, that ſuch a perfect ſimilitude in all thoſe things I have mentioned, could not have ariſen from any trade or commerce betwixt the two nations. For, in the *firſt* place, we know that the Egyptians carried on no trade with any nation: And, 2*dly*, ſuch trade or commerce never could have produced ſo entire a conformity of things, ſo eſſential to the conſtitution and government of every country, as thoſe I have mentioned; but there muſt have been a communication between the two nations more intimate than any trade could produce;—In ſhort, the two nations muſt have mixed and lived ſome time together in the ſame country. Now, the Indians

Indians certainly did not come to Egypt; and, if ſo, the Egyptians muſt have gone to India, and made ſettlements in that country. If, therefore, there was no other evidence of the Egyptians having been in India in very antient times, this alone, which ariſes from the nature of the thing, would be ſufficient to convince me.

But the matter does not reſt upon argument only; for Diodorus Siculus has given us a very particular account, from the Egyptian ſacred books, no doubt, which he ſays, he ſtudied very dilligently, of the expedition of Oſiris, one of the laſt race of their Dæmon or God Kings, as they called them, into India, with a great army; and this expedition he made, he ſays, by land, through Arabia, along the coaſt of the Arabian Gulph, or Red Sea, as we call it *. For it does not appear, that, ſo early as the days of Oſiris, the Egyptians had what could be called a fleet, though they certainly had the uſe of navigation in the earlieſt times; for, otherwiſe, they could not have lived in a country where there was ſuch a river, which once a year overflowed the whole country. But, under Seſoſtris, they had a fleet of 400 ſhips; and, yet, he likewiſe made the expedition by land into India, where he went farther than, it appears, Oſiris did; for he croſſed the Ganges, and overran the country as far as the Ocean †. Now Seſoſtris, according to Herodotus's calculation, which the Prieſts gave him from their books, was the 332d human King, counting from Menes, the firſt human King ‡. Now, this muſt be allowed to be the hiſtorical period of the Egyptian hiſtory, not the mythological or fabulous, as ſome may think it. And, if ſo, it muſt be alſo allowed, that the Egyptians were in India at ſome time or another, unleſs we have a mind to reject the whole hiſtory of Egypt as fabulous.

* Diod. lib. cap. 19.
† Ibid. cap. 55.
‡ Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 79.

But Seſoſtris, as I have ſaid, was not the firſt who went with an army from Egypt to India. He only followed the way, which Oſiris had led to that country: For Oſiris's expedition was not only recorded in the books of the Prieſts of Egypt, but the memory of it was preſerved by tradition in India; and a tradition not among the vulgar, ſays Diodorus, but among the moſt learned of the Indians. According to this tradition, Dionyſius, that is Oſiris, in the moſt antient times, came from the Weſt with a great army into India, introduced civility and arts, and particularly agriculture, and taught them alſo religion. Before he came, the Indians lived in villages; but Dionyſius built for them great and magnificent towns. He reigned in India 52 years; after which the Indian traditions made him die in India*.

In the account Diodorus gives of this tradition, he relates a memorable ſtory preſerved by it; and which, I think, very much confirms the truth of the tradition. The army of Dionyſius was afflicted by a peſtilential diſeaſe, the effect of the extraordinary heat of the ſeaſon. The remedy which the wiſdom of the leader of this army, ſays Diodorus, deviſed for this diſeaſe, was to carry it up to a hill called Μηρος, ſignifying in Greek, and, as it appears, likewiſe, in the Indian language, *a Thigh;* where, by the cool air, and the uſe of pure water immediately from the ſprings, the army was recovered. From hence, he ſays, the Greeks formed the fable of Dionyſius, being incloſed and nouriſhed in the thigh of Jupiter; and thus a true fact may be ſaid to be atteſted by a fable. Here, therefore, we have the truth of this expedition of Oſiris from Egypt to a country ſo diſtant as India, and in the moſt antient times, atteſted not only by a written record in the one country, but by a conſtant tradition preſerved among the moſt learned in the other country.

* Diod. lib. 2. cap. 38.

country. Now, if this be not proof of a fact, I desire to know how any fact of antient history can be proved.

The learned reader may object, that Herodotus, who certainly was very well informed of the history of Egypt, and has given us, as far as he has gone, a most accurate and distinct account of it, has not said a word of the expedition of Osiris into India, the most memorable event of that history. But it is to be observed, that he has said nothing of the actings or sufferings of any of the Dæmon Kings, though, I am persuaded, he knew more of it than Diodorus, or any author who has written of Egypt. But what he knew, he had learned from the Priests under the seal of secrecy, in the same manner as the Eleusinian mysteries, in Greece, were communicated to the initiated. Among other things, it is plain that he knew where some of them were buried; but this he thought it was unlawful to reveal *. From thence, I think, it appears, that the Priests wanted that the vulgar should believe their Dæmon Kings to be truly what they called them, *Gods*, that is, immortal. All, therefore, we learn from Herodotus of the Egyptian Gods is, that there were three races of them, of the last of which, he says, Osiris was one; and, he tells us, further, that the Greeks borrowed the names and adventures of the Egyptian Gods, and ascribed them to men of their own country.

Hercules, too, the Indian traditions said, had been in India; and they dressed him very properly in a lion's skin, (skins being the first cloathing among men), and armed him with a club, which was the first weapon used by men, and is at this day used by the Ourang-Outang. This was a very proper dress and armour for a man who lived in times so very antient; (for he was one of the second race of the Egyptian Gods consisting of twelve); but it was most absurd

* Ταυτα μεν ευστομα κεισθω, is the expression he uses.

in the Greeks, to cloath and arm, in that way, the ſon of Amphytrion, who lived only a generation before the Trojan war. This Egyptian Hercules, Diodorus ſays, begot many children, among whom he divided India; and their race continued to reign there for many generations, ſome of them down to the time of Alexander. He alſo built ſeveral cities, of which he names one, that he calls Palibothra, a great, he ſays, and populous city *.

If there could be any doubt of the Egyptians having been in India, notwithſtanding the records in one country, and the traditions in the other, and the demonſtration which I think ariſes from the nature of the thing, it muſt be entirely removed by monuments which were to be ſeen in India, as late as the days of Diodorus Siculus; who tells us, that, among other towns that Oſiris built in India, there was one which he called Nyſſa, the name of the town in Arabia where he was nurſed. In the ground, about this Indian town, he planted the Ivy, a plant that was conſecrated to him; and our author ſays, that in no other part of India it is found. He adds, that he left ſo many monuments in India, that the Indians of later times claimed him as their countryman †.

I will add to the teſtimony of Diodorus, that of another hiſtorian who had an opportunity of being very much better informed concerning the expeditions of Oſiris and Hercules into India, than Diodorus or any other author who has written upon the ſubject. The author I mean is Arrian, very valuable both for matter and ſtile, and well deſerving the eulogium which Photius has beſtowed on him ‡. He has written a book upon India, and is an author of the greateſt authority, with reſpect to Indian affairs, of any antient author

* Diod. lib. 2. cap. 38.

† Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 19.

‡ See the end of his *Eclogae* from Arrian's Hiſtory of Alexander.

thor that is come down to us: For he has given us an account of that country from Megaſthenes, who was in India when Alexander was there, and who travelled through more of the country than any other of thoſe who accompanied Alexander in that expedition *; and alſo from Nearchus, who commanded Alexander's fleet that ſailed from the mouth of the Indus to Babylon, and who, as Arrian tells us, wrote a Hiſtory of Alexander†. Megaſthenes had an opportunity of being better informed of the hiſtory and antiquities of India, than any other that was with Alexander; for he was with Sandracottus, a great Indian King, and with Porus, who was ſtill a greater King ‡. What, therefore, he relates of the hiſtory of India is, I think, more credible than any thing we have from any other author; and Strabo, though he diſbelieves many of the wonderful ſtories, he tells, of the ſtrange animals in India, ſays nothing againſt his hiſtory of the men of that country. Arrian muſt alſo have got a great deal of information concerning India from what Ptolemy, the ſon of Lagus, who was afterwards King of Egypt, and Ariſtobulus, who, as well as Ptolmey, accompanied Alexander in his Indian expedition, wrote upon the ſubject of that expedition: And, accordingly, he has mentioned ſeveral curious particulars, concerning Indian towns which Alexander took, and Kings that he conquered; which he muſt have learned from thoſe two authors ‖. This author, ſo well informed, ſpeaks of the expeditions of the Egyptians under Oſiris and Hercules, as a fact of which there could be no doubt; and mentions many monuments of Oſiris, that were to be found in India when Alexander was there: And, particularly, he tells the ſame ſtory, which Diodorus tells, of his building the town of Nyſſa; to which he adds his planting the Ivy there, a plant to be found in no other part of

* Arrian's Indica, p. 201. 203. and 318. Edit. Gronovii.

† Arrian, Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

‖ Arrian's Expedition of Alexander, lib. 6. cap. 3. & 14. Alſo Indica, cap. 7. &c.

of India *. He mentions alſo his having taught the Indians the uſe of *Tympana* and *Cymbala* in their battles, and of cloaths of various colours, ſuch as were uſed by the Bacchinals in the rites of Bacchus †. And he mentions a circumſtance related by the Indians concerning the expedition of Oſiris, in which it differed from Alexander's expedition, namely, that Oſiris had no ſhips with him ‡, but made the journey, as Diodorus has related, by land: Whereas, Alexander had a fleet with him, commanded, as I have ſaid, by Nearchus.

It was certainly from the two Kings, I have mentioned, Sandracottus and Porus, that Megaſthenes learned the chronology of India, which Arrian gives us in his ninth chapter; where he tells us, that from Bacchus there were 153 Kings, whoſe reigns amounted to 6042 years, which makes 39½ years to each King, one with another. From the ſame King he muſt have learned, that Bacchus, when he departed from India, left one of his companions, Spartembas by name, the moſt ſkilled in his rites, to govern the Indians, who reigned 25 years, and was ſucceeded by his ſon Boudyas ‖. And there is at this day a tribe of Indians called Afghans, and once a very powerful tribe, who are recorded by an antient hiſtorian of good authority to have been an Egyptian colony §: And, I think, it is very

* Page 340. and 436.

† Page 559.

‡ Page 411.

‖ Indica, cap. 8.

§ This account of the Afghans is given us by an antient Indian Hiſtorian, of the name of *Muttelu ul Anwar*, who is quoted as an author of good authority by another Indian Hiſtorian of the name of Feriſhta, who lived in the beginning of the 17th century, and of whom Mr Dow has given us a tranſlation, (See Dow's Hiſtory of Indoſtan, vol. 1. p. 37); and, I think, it is a Hiſtory very well worth tranſlating.—There is a Hiſtory of the ſame people, tranſlated from the Indian language and preſented to the Literary

very likely, that Oſiris or Seſoſtris would leave a colony of their troops in India, (as Seſoſtris certainly did at Colchis,) in order to eaſe themſelves of their ſuperfluous numbers.

Thus I think I have proved, as much as any fact of antient hiſtory can be proved, that the Egyptians were in India in very antient times. Nor ſhould I have been at ſo great pains to prove, what, from the nature of the thing, I think, is evident, if ſo great an author as Strabo, had not treated, as a fable, the expeditions of Bacchus and Hercules into India. But he does not appear, to me, to have diſtinguiſhed betwixt the Egyptian Bacchus and Hercules, and the Grecian: And, therefore, it is no wonder, that he treats, as fabulous, theſe expeditions of Bacchus and Hercules *. But, he gives neither arguments nor authorities in ſupport of his opinion; and he acknowledges, that Megaſthenes, who, as I have ſaid, accompanied Alexander to India, was of another opinion; and he adds, what I think is not mentioned by Arrian, that Megaſthenes related, that Bacchus was worſhipped, even by the philoſophers of India, in the mountains, and Hercules in the Plains †. Neither do I think that his opinion of the Egyptians never having been in India, is conſiſtant with what he relates of the burial place of the Egyptian Kings,

Literary Society of India by Henry Vauſittart. This tranſlation Sir William Jones has given us in his *Aſiatic Reſearches*, vol. 2. p. 69. According to the account of this author, the Afghans are a colony of Jews, which ſettled in India. Who the author was, and when he lived, who tells this ſtory, we are not informed: But whoever was the author of it, I think very little credit is to be given to it. It is confeſſed by the Gentleman, who preſented it to the Society, (p. 67. ibid.) that the beginning of it is entirely fabulous; and the reſt of it, in my judgment, is of very little value.—The ground work of what remains of it, is the Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament, contained in the two books of Samuel; but with many additional circumſtances, which, I am perſuaded, are fabulous.

* Strabo, p. 505.

† Ibid. lib. 15.

Kings, near to Thebes, where 40 of them were interred, with obeliſks near their ſepulchres, and inſcriptions on theſe obeliſks, which mentioned their power, their wealth, their armies amounting to a million of men, and their empire extending over Scythia, Bactriana, and India*. This Egyptian monument, he appears to have himſelf ſeen. Now, though we ſhould give no faith to the ſacred books of the Egyptians, nor to the traditions preſerved among the learned in India, agreeing with thoſe books, if we will not be convinced by the inſcriptions upon thoſe monuments, more antient, it is likely, than even the books of the Prieſts, I think we muſt give no faith to old monuments of any kind.

Having thus proved by the teſtimonies of antient authors, which I think unqueſtionable, that the Egyptians were in India in very antient times, it does not appear to me neceſſary to add any authorities from modern authors. I will, however, quote one modern author, *M. la Croze*, who has written, in French, a very good book upon India, which he entitles *the Hiſtory of the Chriſtianiſm of the Indies*. In the ſecond volume of this work†, he aſſerts the fact, as a thing that could not be doubted: And he ſays, that the Jeſuit *Father Catrou*, in his *Hiſtory of the Mogul Empire*, and *M. Huet*, Biſhop of Avranches, in his *Hiſtory of the Commerce and Navigation of the Antients*, are of the ſame opinion. And, the firſt he mentions, Father Catrou, he ſays, maintains upon the authority of the Bramins, that the Indians were originally a colony from Egypt. But this, I think, is carrying the matter too far, much farther than is warranted by any antient Hiſtorian. It is enough to ſuppoſe, what, as I have ſaid, is proved by the teſtimony of the Indian Hiſtorian *Muttelu ul Anwar*, quoted by Feriſhta, that the Egyptians, when they overran the country, firſt under Oſiris, and then under Seſoſtris, left behind them

* Ibid. page 1171.

† Page 221.

them a colony, ſuch as Seſoſtris certainly did at Colchis upon the Euxine Sea, when he overran Aſia. But we are not for that to believe that ſo great a country as India was wholly peopled from Egypt. The two authors whom La Croze mentions, Chatrou the Jeſuit, and Biſhop Huet, think the matter, he ſays, ſo clear, that they have not taken the trouble to give any proof of it. But this defect La Croze has ſupplied *, and has ſhown very clearly, from the conformity betwixt the religion and manners of the two countries, that the Egyptians muſt have been in India. Upon this, I have inſiſted very much in the preceding chapter: And, indeed, as the Indians never were in Egypt, I think it is a demonſtration, from the nature of the thing, that the Egyptians muſt have been in India.

And thus, I think, I have proved, both from the nature of the thing, and from the authority of authors, antient and modern, that the Egyptians, in antient times, were in India. Now, this of itſelf is a very important fact in the hiſtory of man, that, in ſo very early an age, a great army ſhould have come all the way by land from Egypt to a country ſo remote as India.

This point being ſettled, the only queſtion that remains to be determined, upon this ſubject of the intercourſe betwixt Egypt and India, is, Whether the Egyptians, when they went to India, learned civility and arts there, or taught them to the Indians? This, in my opinion, is no difficult queſtion, though I know, there are who maintain, that the Egyptians got their arts and ſciences from the Indians. For, in the *firſt* place, if we believe the tradition among the learned in India, there can be no doubt, that the Egyptians imported civility and arts into that country. 2*do*, I think it is impoſſible, by the nature of things, that a country, without civility and arts, ſhould have undertaken, and conducted ſo well, ſo great an expedition to ſo diſtant

* Vol. 2. p. 222.

a country; nor is there any example of the like in the hiſtory of man. All the nations, which have got their civility and arts from other nations, have not come to theſe nations, but theſe nations have come to them, and have conquered them, and in that way civiliſed them, and introduced arts among them; and, in this way, Oſiris, with an armed force, civiliſed the Indians. *Itio*, The Indians, ſo far from having it in their power to give a ſyſtem of polity to the Egyptians, ſuch as I have ſhown they enjoyed, and the arts and ſciences they poſſeſſed, were themſelves in a moſt barbarous ſtate when Oſiris came among them. This is atteſted by the author before mentioned, Arrian, who, as I have obſerved, was better informed concerning Indian affairs, than any other Greek writer, having taken his account of the Indians from Megaſthenes, who got his information from the Indians themſelves, and particularly from the Princes of the country. He ſays, that the Indians, before Oſiris introduced civility and arts among them, were quite barbarous, feeding upon the barks of trees*. Even as late as the days of Darius the Perſian King, Herodotus tells us, that there was a people in India, whom he calls Καλατιαι, who inſtead of burying or burning their dead parents, ate them †. And he mentions another people of India, called Παδαιαι, who were ſo wild, that they lived a nomade life, and fed upon raw fleſh. Theſe people, he ſays, were even more barbarous men eaters than the Καλατιαι; for, when any of their number fell ſick, his neareſt relations killed him, and ate him, alledging that his dying a lingering death, by diſeaſe, would make his fleſh worſe food: And though he maintained, that he was not dying, but would recover, they would not take his word for it, but put him to death, and feaſted on him ‡. And theſe Indians, he ſays, copulated promiſcuouſly and openly as the brutes do ‖. And he ſpeaks of this people as exiſting in

* Indica, cap. 5. p. 325.

† Lib. 3. cap. 38.

‡ Ibid. cap. 99.

‖ Ibid. cap. 100.

in his time: Nor are we to wonder that the arts, which Oſiris imported into India, were not propagated all over that great country, inhabited by ſo many different people, but were confined to thoſe nations, where Oſiris, or Hercules, or their ſucceſſors, reigned, and to ſome other in their neighbourhood, which, by communication, may have got thoſe arts from them.

If there could be any doubt, that the Egyptians were the teachers of the Indians, and not their ſcholars, it is entirely removed by monuments ſtill to be ſeen in India; I mean ſtatues or buſts of *black men with woolly hair*, and which are reverenced by the natives as the images of Gods. Now, there is no ſuch thing in India, as men with woolly hair; nor are the Indians ſo black as the Egyptians were, but only of a dark ſwarthy colour. And not only in India but in China, where the people are all fair, and likewiſe in Japan, are ſuch images to be ſeen. Bryant, in his Antient Mythology *, gives us, in the words of a man who writes a hiſtory of the Dutch embaſſies to Japan, a deſcription of a great temple in the city of Miacro in that country, where there is a great idol with black woolly hair. He mentions another †, in another temple, whoſe hair was likewiſe black and woolly; and ſpeaks alſo ‡ of other Mooriſh figures or idols with woolly hair. Among the Siameſe, he ſays, their deity, *Boudha*, is repreſented in the ſame way: And, he adds, that *black*, in Japan, is a colour of good omen, which, he ſays, is extraordinary; for the Japaneſe are by no means black, nor has their hair any tendency to wool ‖. And, in the country of Siam, there is one remarkable buſt of that kind, to which religious worſhip is paid, as Kempfer in his travels has related. Now, the images of thoſe black woolly haired men, can be worſhipped as Gods, for no other reaſon, except that the perſons, whom they repreſent, taught the people of the ſe-

* Vol. 3. p. 577. and 578. † Page 580.

‡ Page 581. ‖ Ibidem.

veral countries where they are to be found, arts and ſciences; the ſame reaſon, for which, Diodorus Siculus ſays, the Egyptians deified their firſt Kings.

Images of black men with woolly hair, being worſhipped as Gods in India, is not, to my great ſurpriſe, taken notice of by any of the writers, that I have mentioned, upon the ſubject of Egypt and India, though, I think, it proves moſt clearly, that it was the Egyptians, who imported a religion, arts, and ſciences, into India. Nations, and the races of men, are diſtinguiſhed by their bodies, as well as by their minds, and particularly by the colour of their bodies, and alſo by the colour, form, and figure, of their hair: And in that way, at this day, are the negroes of Africa diſtinguiſhed, not only from the nations of Europe, but from the nations of Aſia, and even from the Indians, who, as I have ſaid, indeed are black, not ſo black, however, as the negroes of Africa, but are not woolly haired. And this diſtinction, betwixt the Egyptians and other nations, was as well known in the days of Herodotus, as it is now: For, he tells us, that the Colchians, a colony left by Seſoſtris upon the Euxine Sea, were known to be of Egyptian origin, by their having woolly hair *. And the ſame author tells us, that of the Æthiopians, (under which name the antients comprehended all black men), thoſe, who inhabited Lybia, were of all men the moſt woolly haired. Now theſe Lybian or African woolly haired men certainly comprehended the Egyptians, and thoſe whom we now call negroes: Whereas the eaſtern Æthiopians, Herodotus ſays, were ſtraight haired men. Of the hair of the Indians he ſays nothing. But Strabo has informed us of many particulars concerning the Indians, and among others, he has told us, in expreſs words, that they were ἰθυτρ·χες, or *ſtraight haired* †.

And

* See Herodot. lib. 7. cap. 70.; alſo the Note (‡) at the bottom of p. 144. of vol. 3. of this work.

† Strabo, lib. 15. p. 696. marked on the margin.

And thus, I think, it is proved, that the Egyptians were diſtinguiſhed, and remarkably diſtinguiſhed, by their woolly hair, not only from other nations, but particularly from the Indians: And, therefore, we know, that thoſe idols of black woolly haired men, to be ſeen in India and the neighbouring countries, are images of Egyptian men, by the ſame token that Herodotus knew the Colchians to be originally from Egypt. And, indeed, this makes ſo great a difference in men, that, if there had been no other proof of the Egyptians having come to India, and having given the people there religion, arts, and civility, than thoſe idols of black men with woolly hair, ſo different in their appearance from the natives of India and all the other people in that part of the world, I ſhould have thought it ſufficient.

With reſpect to thoſe black woolly haired idols in India, it is proper to obſerve another thing that has not been taken notice of by any of the writers upon the antiquities of Egypt and India: It is what Arrian tells us in the paſſage above quoted *, that the name of a ſucceſſor of Oſiris in India, was *βουδυας*. Now, this *Boudyas* is well known in India, under the name of *Boudha* †; and is adored as a divinity, under the figure of a black woolly haired man. It appears, that his religion was propagated, not only to India, but to many of thoſe eaſtern countries, ſuch as Siam and China; and even to the Iſlands of Ceylon and Japan. In the Iſland of Ceylon he is known by the name of *Budu* ‡; for, as his religion was propagated to ſo many different countries, his name was differently pronounced according to the different dialects of thoſe countries, but always with a ſimilitude, greater or leſs, to the original name of *Boudyas*. Mr Bailly, in his letter upon the origin

* Page 302.

† See M. de Guigne's Treatiſe upon the Religion of India, in the 40th vol. of the Memoires of the French Academy, p. 197.

‡ La Croze, tom. 2. p. 349.

origin of the ſciences, calls him *Buta*. In what country he takes that name, he does not tell us; but, he ſays, that he is the ſame with the *Fo-hoo* of China, and with the God of the Japaneſe, of the Iſland of Ceylon, and of Siam*. The Japaneſe pronounce his name *Budua*, as M. de Guignes tells us †. The Chineſe tranſlate his name, and call him, as I have ſaid, *Fo-hoo*, which, in their language, ſignifies *what is very pure*. Of theſe two words they uſe but the firſt, and call him *Fo*; and by that name his religion is well known all over the eaſt. It is, as M. de Guignes informs us in the treatiſe above quoted ‡, not only the moſt antient religion of India, but it is the religion of China, Japan, Thibet, and a great part of Tartary, and alſo of ſome of the eaſtern iſlands, ſuch as Ceylon. He was known to be the God of India, in the days of Clemens of Alexandria, who mentions him under the name of *Boota*: And St Jerom alſo ſpeaks of him, and calls him *Budda* ‖.

Thus, I think, it is proved, that the Egyptian religion, and with it no doubt civility and arts, were carried not only to India; but from thence were propagated all over the eaſt.

That the Egyptian religion went to Japan, Sir William Jones has given us a moſt convincing proof, which Kempfer furniſhes him, who, as he tells us, reſided long in Japan, and had a familiar intercourſe with the principal inhabitants of the country §. He ſays, that the Egyptian idolatry has prevailed in Japan from the earlieſt ages: And, among the idols worſhipped there, is a goddeſs with many arms, repreſenting the powers of nature, in Egypt called *Iſis*, and in India *Iſani* or *Iſi*. And this image, ſays our author, as it is exhibited

* Vol. 1. p. 123. and 124.

† Vol. 40. of the Memoirs of the French Academy, p. 197.

‡ Page 197.

‖ La Croze, tom. 2. p. 319.—320.

§ See Sir William Jones's Aſiatic Reſearches, vol. 2. p. 379.

exhibited by the German traveller, (that is Kempfer), all the Germans, to whom I ſhowed it, immediately recogniſed with a mixture of pleaſure and enthuſiaſm *.

There is a memorial of another Egyptian Dæmon preſerved in thoſe eaſtern countries, not by any ſtatue or buſt, but in a way more proper for ſuch a wicked Dæmon. It is by the name of *Typhon*, which they give to a dreadful hurricane, that very often rages in the ſea betwixt China and Japan. This information I had from more than one traveller in China. And to this may be added, what Sir William Jones tells us†, of the abhorrence which the Indians have of the colour *red*, which was the colour of Typhon, as Diodorus informs us‡, and was therefore abhorred by the Egyptians.

That the Indians make the ſame diſtinction that the Egyptians do betwixt the religion of the philoſopher and that of the people, I have obſerved in the preceding chapter ‖, where I have ſaid, that, in their ſacred books, the unity of God is maintained, and that they believe alſo in the doctrine of the Trinity, and in other doctrines of theology, which were maintained by the Prieſts in Egypt. And as they got their philoſophical religion from Egypt, ſo alſo they got their popular: For Sir William Jones tells us§, that the Trident of Neptune, the Eagle of Jupiter, the Satyrs of Bacchus, the Bow of Cupid, and the Chariot of the Sun, are all to be ſeen in India at this day. Theſe, Sir William ſays, are all to be found in Greece and Italy; but it is certain, that the Greeks, as well as the Romans, derived their religion from Egypt: And as the Indians never had any communication,

* Ibid. p. 380.

† Ibid. p. 378.

‡ Page 291.

‖ Ibid. p. 292.

§ Aſiat. Reſearch. vol. 1. p. 424.

communication, in antient times, with the Greeks and Italians, nor ever at any time borrowed religion, cuſtoms, and manners, from them, we muſt ſuppoſe, that they got theſe, as well as other things, from Egypt.

As to arts and ſciences, Sir William, in the paſſage above quoted, ſays, that the Bramins and a learned ſect in India, that he calls *Sermanes*, diſpute in the Forms of Logic; and the Jeſuit, father Pons, tells us, that they ſtudy logic very much, and examine moſt accurately the different Figures and Moods of the Syllogiſm: And Sir William adds, 'That they diſcourſe on the vanity of human enjoyments, and the 'immortality of the ſoul, her emanation from the eternal mind, her 'debaſement, wanderings, and final union with her ſource.' Then he mentions, 'the ſix philoſophical ſchools, whoſe principles are ex-'plained in the *Darſaua Saſtra*, which,' he ſays, 'compriſe all the 'metaphyſics of the old academy, the Stoa, the Lycaeum: Nor is 'it poſſible to read the Vedanta, or the many fine compoſitions in 'illuſtration of it, without believing, that Pythagoras and Plato de-'rived their ſublime theories from the ſame fountain with the ſages 'of India*.' And, as to arts, he ſays, that they have numerous works upon Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Muſic, all which, he adds, are excellent and acceſſible†. Now, I ſay, that it is impoſſible, that a nation, in the ſtate in which the Indians were, when the Egyptians came among them‡, could have invented thoſe ſciences and arts, but muſt have got them from the Egyptians together with their religion and their polity; and as ſciences and arts never can be invented without a language of art, if I ſhall ſucceed in proving, as I hope I ſhall, that the Indians got even their language from Egypt, this, I think, will be demonſtration, that the Indians got all their arts

* Ibid. p. 425.

† Ibid. p. 429.

‡ See Page 306. of this vol.

arts and ſciences from Egypt. And, I am perſuaded, as I have elſewhere obſerved, that more of the learning and philoſophy went from Egypt to India, than went from Egypt to Greece, and from thence came to us. I hold, therefore, that it is chiefly in India that we are to ſearch for thoſe arts and ſciences, and that *wiſdom* or *philoſophy*, as the word ought to be tranſlated *, which Moſes learned in Egypt: And, I think, it does great honour to Britain, that we have ſent to India ſo great a ſcholar as Sir William Jones, who, with the aſſiſtance of the learned ſociety which he has there formed, will in time produce to the world the treaſures of learning to be found in India. He is by this time, no doubt, maſter of the key of their knowledge, I mean the Shanſcrit language; which, in a letter that I had from him two or three years ago, he told me, he had then diſcovered, to be a moſt perfect language, more perfect than even the Greek. Now, in this language, all the books upon arts and ſciences in India are written.

Thus, I think, I have proved, not only that the Egyptians were in India, but that they carried with them to that country, religion and polity, arts and ſciences: And, that their religion and arts were from India propagated to the neighbouring countries, not only thoſe upon the continent, but to the iſlands ſuch as Ceylon and Japan.

If this be ſo, it muſt appear very ſurpriſing, that the French academician, M. de Guignes, who has written three diſſertations upon the religion and the arts of India, publiſhed in the 40th vol. of the Memoirs of the French Academy, ſhould never have thought of deriving the religion and arts of India from Egypt, but has made them to be all of their own growth, which, as I have ſaid †, was impoſſible among a people, who, I have ſhown, were in antient times altogether bar-

* Origin of Language, vol. 5. p. 301.

† Page 312. of this vol.

barous and ſavage. And it is the more ſurpriſing, that, in the ſame volume, he has publiſhed a diſſertation, to prove that the Chineſe got their religion and philoſophy from the Egyptians; and, in another volume of theſe memoirs, he has maintained, that they were originally an Egyptian colony. Now, if the Egyptians travelled as far as China, and introduced a religion and philoſophy there, it would be very extraordinary, if they had not taken India in their way, and carried to that country, likewiſe, religion, arts, and ſciences. But it appears to me, that M. de Guignes did not know, or did not believe, that the Egyptians ever were in India; for that they had religion, arts, and ſciences, among them, he acknowledges, when he ſays, that they carried them to China.

Among other things that they carried to China, M. de Guignes, in a very ingenious treatiſe that he has written upon the compariſon of the hieroglyphics of Egypt with the Chineſe written language, has ſhown a wonderful connection betwixt that language and the hieroglyphics of Egypt. And there is one ſimilarity, which, I think, it is not improper here to take notice of, as it ſhows that the Egyptians invented one art more than thoſe I have mentioned. The art I mean is the notation of numbers, not by words, but by certain ſigns or marks, ſuch as are neceſſary in ſetting down and operating upon numbers; which could not be done, if they were many in number, by words. M. de Guignes has particularly obſerved, that, in the Egyptian hieroglyphics and the written language of China, the number *ten* is expreſſed by the ſame mark, viz. the letter X. It was marked in the ſame way by the Romans; and it is ſo at this day by us, in imitation of them: And as the Romans were a moſt antient colony of Greeks, who came to Italy 17 generations before the Trojan war, as the Halicarnaſſian informs us, I can have no doubt, but that it was the antient mark for that number among the Greeks, which they got, with their other arts and ſciences, from the Egyptians,

tians, where it certainly was in moſt antient times. From the Roman notation of numbers, we may learn the whole progreſs of the art as it was firſt practiſed: They began by marking *unity* by a ſimple ſtraight perpendicular line: With ſuch lines they went on counting till they came to the number *five*: And this they marked by two of theſe lines joined together at the lower end, ſo as to form an acute angle, and make this figure, V. Then they went on adding to this number, V, four units, marked, as I have ſaid, by ſtraight lines: And thus they arrived at the number *ten*; which was very properly, I think, marked by adding the two *fives* together, ſo as to ſet the one above the other; which makes the figure X. And then they went on counting by units, fives, and tens, till they came to greater numbers, ſuch as 50, 100, 500, and 1000, which they marked by the letters L, C, D, and M. It appears, therefore, that the firſt arithmetic was quinary, and not decimal, as among us; and that men at firſt proceeded in numbering by *fives*, as Proteus did in numbering his ſea calves *. And it was very natural that men, when they firſt began to number, ſhould firſt count the fingers of one hand; and, ſtopping there, ſhould begin again, and go to the fingers of the other hand. In this way they counted 10, and there they alſo ſtopped, and again went over the ſame numeration: And it was this ſecond ſtop, which, I am perſuaded, introduced the decimal arithmetic.

And here it may not be improper to obſerve, how much better the notation of numbers, by what we call Arabian cyphers, but which, as is well known, are truly Indian, is than the Roman notation; by the Indian notation all numbers, however great, are expreſſed by nine figures, with the addition of *zeros*, denoting only that any of the nine figures prefixed is to be underſtood as multiplied by as many *tens* as there are *zeros*. In this way, not only the greateſt numbers are eaſily marked, but every operation upon them, of adding,

* Odyſſ. lib. 4. v. 412.

ding, ſubſtracting, multiplying, and dividing, practiſed in the eaſieſt way. This art, however, was abſolutely unknown to the Greeks and Romans. But, I think, it is probable, that it was an Egyptian invention in later times, after they had taken to alphabetical writing, and diſuſed hieroglyphical: So that, I believe, it came from Egypt to India as well as other arts. For, I can hardly perſuade myſelf that the Indians could have invented it, any more than other arts, which they certainly got from Egypt: Nor do I think, it is well vouched that the Indians have invented any art of any conſequence.

The notation of numbers by the antient Egyptian, Roman, and Indian marks, is all that remains in Europe of the moſt antient of all writing, that is the hieroglyphical. And, though it be very much inferior to the alphabetical writing, which, at the ſame time that it preſents to us the ideas intended to be expreſſed, gives us alſo the language or ſounds, by which ſpeech expreſſes them; (ſo that we have, at the ſame time, a language that is both ſpoken and written); yet, with regard to the expreſſion of numbers, it is much more commodious than any language that is ſpoken or written: For no great operations upon numbers could be performed either by words or writing; whereas, by thoſe hieroglyphical marks, and particularly by the Arabian cyphers, as we call them, they are performed with the greateſt eaſe, and alſo with the greateſt clearneſs and diſtinctneſs.

Thus, I think, I have proved, that arts and ſciences came from Egypt to India, even the neceſſary arts of life, ſuch as agriculture. And, indeed, the Indians, when the Egyptians came among them, were in ſuch a barbarous ſtate, that, I think, it is impoſſible, they could have invented any art of the leaſt value, and much leſs ſcience: And I will endeavour to prove, in the next chapter, that they had not invented that art, which is the parent art of all others, and at the

ſame

ſame time of moſt difficult invention, I mean language; though it is poſſible, that they may have varied and diſtinguiſhed their animal cries by ſome articulate ſounds, which they might have learned by imitation of ſome birds, ſuch as the cuckoo. But a language of art they never could have formed, but muſt have learned it from the Egyptians, by whom they were taught their other arts and ſciences; for a language of art is itſelf a work of ſcience, and even of philoſophy. Analyſis, which is the great work of ſcience, and without which there can be neither ſcience nor philoſophy, muſt be practiſed in forming a language of art, of which not only the ſound muſt be analyſed, and ſo an alphabet formed, as was done in Egypt, but the ſenſe of the words muſt alſo be analyſed into what is called *the parts of ſpeech*, but which are firſt analyſed according to the method of Ariſtotle into *ſubſtances* and *accidents*, each of which again is ſo analyſed and ſubdivided, as to produce the parts of ſpeech we uſe, without the knowledge of which, there can be no art of language. Such an art, the work of ſcience and even of philoſophy, I call the parent art of all other arts and of all ſciences, without which no other art of any value, and much leſs ſcience, could have been invented, or communicated when invented. Now, if I can prove, that this art was not only invented in Egypt, (and where elſe could it have been invented, but in the only country then in the world where there was ſcience and philoſophy), but was carried by the Egyptians to India, I think, it muſt be preſumed, that it came from Egypt to countries leſs diſtant than India, and from them to every other country of the earth. And, if ſo, then Egypt is truly what I have all along ſuppoſed it to be, in the courſe of this work, the native country of all arts and ſciences.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Egyptians muſt have had the uſe of a Language of Art before they could have invented ſo many Arts and Sciences, as it is proved they did invent.—This Language they muſt have invented themſelves, or got from ſome other country;—no other country but Egypt, where it could have been invented.—The Phœnicians could not have been the inventors of a Language of Art, for reaſons which are given.—The queſtion is, Whether Oſiris carried to India the Language of Egypt, as well as its other arts?—If the language of India were a barbarous language, it could not be ſuppoſed to have come from Egypt.—But the Shanſcrit, the original language of India, a language of the greateſt art.—This proved by the teſtimony of Sir William Jones, and of Braſſey Halhed:—It excels in the three great arts of language, Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection, and particularly in the laſt.—In the pronunciation it has both Melody and Rhythm;—and its Poetry is formed by ſhort and long ſyllables:—A ſpecimen of that Poetry given by Braſſey Halhed.—In that ſpecimen, the words are of great length, and full of vowels.—Their alphabet conſiſts of 50 letters.—The long and ſhort vowels marked by different characters.—The author learned more of the Shanſcrit language from Mr Wilkins than he has learned any other way.—Mr Wilkins has proved by fact, what the Author thought could be only proved by argument, that the Shanſcrit was the Egyptian language imported into India by Oſiris.—This proved by comparing the Greek with the Shanſcrit.—General reflections on the tranſmiſſion of languages from one country to another, and the changes thereby made in the languages.—And, firſt, as to the pronunciation.—

That

That changes in the ſame nation; but much more when a language is carried to a different nation, and that nation at a great diſtance.—2dly, *As to the ſenſe of the words.—This changed, too, by the language going to a different country.—Examples of derivative languages much changed from the original;—ſuch as the Italian, French, and Spaniſh, and the dialects of the Gothic.—Though theſe languages did not travel far, yet ſo changed as not to be intelligible, though one underſtands the parent language:—So different alſo from one another, that the underſtanding of one will not make you underſtand another.—The change muſt have been much greater in the antient Egyptian language, when it travelled as far as India, and was introduced among a people ſo barbarous as the Indians then were.—As it is ſpoken by the common people there, it is not to be known for the language of antient Egypt, but preſerved among the Bramins.—Another obſervation upon the paſſage of language from one country to another.—The pronunciation muſt be very much changed, particularly of the vowels;—alſo of the conſonants.—Words of the ſame ſound do not prove two languages to be the ſame,—not even if they be of the ſame ſenſe likewiſe, unleſs there be many of them, or words that muſt have been original in all languages.—A conformity betwixt two languages in the three great arts of language, Compoſition, Derivation, and Flection, the ſureſt proof of their being originally the ſame language.—The names of numbers, and of members of the human body, and of relations, muſt be original words in all languages.*—1ſt, *Of the names of numbers.—Theſe in Shanſcrit the ſame as in Greek and Latin.—Some anomalies in theſe numbers of the Shanſcrit, and the ſame in Greek and Latin.—The names of the members of the human body the ſame in Shanſcrit as in Greek and Latin,—alſo the names of Relations.—The name of God in Shanſcrit, the ſame as in Greek and Latin,—many words of the Shanſcrit more Latin than Greek.—Inſtances of that.—A difference in the ſound of the words in Shanſcrit, and in Greek, and Latin.*

—*This*

—This accounted for, from the great changes in the pronunciation of language.—Of Greek names of places and perſons in India, when Alexander was there,—theſe names more Greek than the preſent Shanſcrit.—The reaſon of this.—A great many more Greek words to be collected from the Shanſcrit.—Mr Wilkins has given the author about 70 more.—Other words he has got from other travellers in India.—Of the reſemblance of the two languages in the three great arts of language, Compoſition, Derivation, and Flection.—Examples of compoſition in the Shanſcrit.—One extraordinary compoſition, with the A privative, *as common in the Shanſcrit as in the Greek.—Of derivation in the Shanſcrit, Mr Wilkins has given the author no example,—but it is uſed in that language as well as compoſition and flection.—Of flection in the Shanſcrit.—The great variety of this art of language.—Verbs in μι in the Shanſcrit as well as in the Greek,—a ſpecimen of four perſons of the preſent tenſe of the ſubſtantive verb in the Shanſcrit, the ſame with the Greek and Latin.—Mr Wilkins, by comparing the two languages, has proved that in fact the two languages are the ſame,—has ſettled, in this way, a fact which was denied by ſome antient authors, that the Egyptians were in India.—The learned world thereby much obliged to him.*

BEFORE I undertook to prove, that the Egyptians were the inventors of the art of language, I thought it was proper to prove, that they had invented other arts and ſciences*. This I hope I have done to the ſatisfaction of my readers; and if ſo, the neceſſary conſequence is, that they muſt have had the uſe of language, and of a language of art, without which it is impoſſible that arts and ſciences can be invented or cultivated. This language, therefore, they muſt either have invented themſelves, or got it from ſome other

* Book 2. chap. 4. of this vol.

ther nation. Now, I deſire to know, what other nation there was, in thoſe very antient times, that could have invented ſo great an art and of more difficult invention than any other. Some, as I have obſerved, think that the Phœnicians may have been the inventors of this art; and that the Egyptians may have got it from them. But I think I have ſhown *, that it is not only in the higheſt degree improbable, but even impoſſible, that ſuch a nation as the Phœnicians ſhould have invented a language of art, the moſt wonderful of all arts, and, at the ſame time, of the moſt difficult invention; and I have ſhown alſo, that it is highly probable that, as they antiently lived in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians, they got this art, as well as other nations did, from the Egyptians. And they borrowed one thing from the Egyptians, which no other nation did, I mean circumciſion †; for the Colchians, who practiſed circumciſion, were a colony of Egyptians; and the Jews were directed by their God to uſe that rite.

Taking it, therefore, for granted, that the Egyptians invented the language of art they muſt have uſed, I am to inquire, in this chapter, whether Oſiris, with the other arts he brought with him to India, did not alſo bring the art of language. If the language of India were a barbarous jargon, ſuch as the languages I have mentioned in the firſt volume of the Origin of Language, it might be thought to have been invented by themſelves, or learned from ſome other barbarous nation in their neighbourhood. But if it can be ſhown to be a language of the greateſt art, ſuch as never could have been invented by the Indians, in the ſtate they were in when Oſiris came among them, nor by any other nation in the world except the Egyptians, it will follow of courſe, that it muſt have been imported by Oſiris. Now, the original language of India, of which all the other languages

* See p. 277. of this vol.

† See Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 632. (2d edition).

ſpoken in that country are dialects more or leſs corrupt *, is the Shanſcrit, the moſt perfect language that is, or, I believe, ever was, on this earth; for it is more perfect than the Greek. This Sir William Jones, who is well known to be learned in many different languages, and particularly in the Greek, has told us in one of his publications: But if he had not ſaid ſo, we know ſo many particulars concerning the form and ſtructure of it, as to be convinced that he is in the right.

Mr Braſſey Halhed, in his preface to the tranſlation of the Code of Gentoo Languages, has told us ſeveral things concerning the Shanſcrit, which ſhow it to be a language of the greateſt art: And particularly it abounds in flection, which, as I have more than once obſerved, is the greateſt art of language: For it has no leſs than ſeven declenſions, with ſingular, dual, and plural numbers; and in the other two great arts of language, derivation and compoſition, it is alſo, he ſays, very abundant. The pronounciation of it, he ſays, is as muſical as that of the Greek, having both melody and rhythm; ſo that, when it is ſpoken, it appears to be a kind of recitative, very like what the Jews uſe in their ſynagogues †. Their poetry, like the Greek and Latin, is formed by long and ſhort ſyllables ‡: And our author, in his preface ||, has given us ſome ſpecimens of their moſt antient poetry, where the quantities are exactly marked; and it is to be obſerved, that the words are of great length, and full of vowels, which muſt give a very pleaſant ſound to their poetry, and in general to their language. Their alphabet, he ſays, conſiſts of 50 letters, and their ſhort and long vowels are marked by different characters, which ſhows the regard they have to the rhythm of their language; and it is to be wiſhed, that the Greeks and Romans had ſhown the ſame regard to

* The names of places and of perſons, which in all languages muſt have been among the firſt words, are all, according to my information, Shanſcrit words.

† Page 25. ‡ Page 27. || Page 26.

to the rhythm of their languages, which would have ſaved the ſcholar a great deal of time and trouble.

But, concerning the Shanſcrit, I have not learned ſo much from any author that I have read, nor from any man with whom I have converſed, as from Mr Wilkins. He, as I have ſaid elſewhere*, ſtudied this language for 16 years under two Bramin maſters, and, I am perſuaded, underſtands more of it than any man in Europe. Before I had the pleaſure of his acquaintance, I thought it highly probable, that a language of ſo great art as the Shanſcrit could not have been invented in a country ſo barbarous as India was when the Egyptians came to it, but was imported into India with other arts by Oſiris. But now I am not only convinced of this by arguments, but Mr Wilkins has proved it by facts: For he has proved to my conviction, ſuch a reſemblance betwixt the Greek and the Shanſcrit, that the one muſt be a dialect of the other, or both of the ſame original language. Now, the Greek is certainly not a dialect of the Shanſcrit, any more than the Shanſcrit is of the Greek. They muſt, therefore, be both dialects of the ſame language: And that language could be no other than the language of Egypt, brought into India by Oſiris, of which undoubtedly the Greek was a dialect, as I think I have proved †. But, before I give the reader the proofs which Mr Wilkins has furniſhed me, by comparing the two languages together, and ſhowing how much they reſemble one another, I will make ſome general reflections upon the tranſmiſſion of languages from one country or nation to another, and what changes they muſt neceſſarily undergo in their paſſage.

And, in the *firſt* place, as language is an art of vulgar and daily uſe, paſſing through the mouths of the whole people of a country,

* Vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 149. in the note at the bottom of the page.

† Vol. 1. Origin of Language, book 3. chap. 13.

it muſt neceſſarily undergo many alterations even in the ſame nation; nor do I believe, that there is a nation at preſent in Europe, in which the language now ſpoken is the ſame that was ſpoken three or four hundred years ago. But the change muſt be much greater, when the language paſſes to a nation living at a great diſtance, and under a different climate, and where conſequently the organs of pronunciation muſt be affected more or leſs by the difference of climate. And not only the pronounciation of the words, in this paſſage, from one country to another, will be changed, but alſo the ſenſe of the words, which is a thing as arbitrary as the ſound, and therefore very liable to be altered, as well as the ſound, by common uſe.

How much a language, derived from another, may be changed from the original, both in ſound and ſenſe, the French, the Italian, and Spaniſh languages are a clear proof. They are undoubtedly derived from the Latin, and yet are languages ſo different from the Latin, as not to be underſtood by a man who only underſtands the original language; and ſo different from one another, that the knowledge of one of them will not make you underſtand the other two; yet there is a great ſimilarity to the Latin in the ſound of very many of the words, and in the ſenſe alſo; and there is a good deal of the art of the Latin language in them, particularly in the genders and numbers of nouns, and in the tenſes of verbs formed by flection, though they have loſt the forming the caſes of nouns by flection. The ſame is the caſe of the Engliſh and other dialects of the Gothic, which are ſo much changed from the original language, preſerved in Iceland, that the knowledge of it will not make you underſtand any of its dialects ſpoken on the continent of Europe, and which are all ſo different from one another, that by underſtanding one of them you do not underſtand any other of them. Now, if theſe languages, which did not travel far, (and one of them did not travel at all,

all, I mean the Italian, but was learned by the Goths and Lombards in the country itſelf), are ſo much changed from the original, What muſt have been the caſe of the language of Egypt, which travelled as far as India, and was imported among a people ſo barbarous as the Indians then were, very much more barbarous than thoſe nations who learned the Latin or the Gothic? And, accordingly, the Shanſcrit, which, I think, I may call the original language, is ſo much corrupted in the common dialects of it ſpoken in India, that if it had not been preſerved among the Bramins or Prieſts, one of the inſtitutions, which Oſiris brought with him, among many others, from Egypt, it would have been entirely loſt; but, as it is preſerved among them, it appears to be a more pure dialect, of the antient Egyptian, than even the Greek.

Another obſervation, I make upon the tranſmiſſion of languages from one country to another, is, that the pronunciation muſt needs be very much altered, and particularly that of the vowels, which, as they are nothing but the breath modified in a certain way, are very liable to be changed in the ſame language ſpoken in the ſame country, as is evident from innumerable examples that might be quoted in Greek and Latin. The conſonants, too, of the ſame organ, are very apt to be changed into one another, even by the people of the ſame country, but much more by foreigners who learn the language, and whoſe organs of pronunciation, if they live under a different climate, muſt, as I have obſerved, be affected by the climate, and therefore operate differently. Another obſervation I make is, that ſome words, in different languages, being of the ſame ſound, will not prove the language to have been originally the ſame; for that may happen by accident, and even if ſome words ſhould be the ſame in ſenſe as well as in ſound, neither will that prove the languages to be of the ſame origin; for it often happens, that one language borrows words from another, though the one language be not the original

of

of the other, nor both derived from the ſame original. But, in order to prove that the languages were originally the ſame, there muſt be many words in both agreeing in ſenſe as well as ſound, and theſe ſuch as muſt have been original words in every language, denoting things which muſt firſt have got names in every language; ſo that when theſe names are the ſame in two languages, we are ſure that the two muſt have been originally the ſame.

My laſt obſervation is, that, as the art of a language is leſs arbitrary and more determined by rule than either the ſound or ſenſe of the words, it is one of the principal things, by which the connection of languages with one another is to be diſcovered: And, therefore, when we find that two languages practiſe the three great arts of language, derivation, compoſition, and flection, in the ſame way, we may conclude, I think, with great certainty, that the one language is the original of the other, or that they are both dialects of the ſame language.

To apply theſe obſervations to the ſimilarities which Mr Wilkins has diſcovered betwixt the Shanſcrit and the Greek;—I will begin with theſe words, which, as I have ſaid, muſt have been original words in all languages, as the things denoted by them muſt have been known in the firſt ages of civility, and have got names; ſo that it is impoſſible, that one language could have borrowed them from another, unleſs it was a dervative or dialect of that language. Of this kind are the names of numbers, of the members of the human body, and of relations, ſuch as that of *father*, *mother*, and *brother*.

And, *firſt*, as to numbers, the uſe of which muſt have been coeval with civil ſociety. The words in the Shanſcrit, for the numbers from *one* to *ten*, are *ek*, *dwee*, *tree*, *chatoor*, *panch*, *ſhat*, *ſapt*, *aght*, *nava*,

nava, *das*, which certainly have an affinity to the Greek or Latin names for thoſe numbers. Then they proceed towards 20, ſaying *ten* and *one*, *ten* and *two*, and ſo forth, till they come to 20; for their arithmetic is decimal as well as ours. Twenty they expreſs by the word *veenſatee*. Then they go on till they come to 30, which they expreſs by the word *treenſat*, of which the word expreſſing *three* is part of the compoſition, as well as it is of the Greek and Latin names for thoſe numbers: And in like manner they go on expreſſing 40, 50, &c. by a like compoſition, with the words expreſſing ſimple numbers, viz 4, 5, &c. till they come to the number 100, which they expreſs by *ſat*, a word different from either the Greek or Latin name for that number. But, in this numeration, there is a very remarkable conformity betwixt the word in Shanſcrit expreſſing *twenty* or *twice ten*, and the words in Greek and Latin expreſſing the ſame number; for in none of the three languages has the word any relation to the number 2, which, by multiplying 10, makes 20, ſuch as the words expreſſing the numbers 30, 40, &c. have to the words expreſſing *three* or *four*; for in Greek the word is εἴκοσι, which expreſſes no relation to the number *two*; nor does the Latin *viginti*, but which appears to have more reſemblance to the Shanſcrit word *veenſatee*. And, thus it appears, that in the anomalies of the two languages of Greek and Latin, there appears to be ſome conformity with the Shanſcrit.

As to the members of the human body, Mr Wilkins has given me the names of three of them, of the *foot*, which is *pada*, undoubtedly the ſame with the πους ποδος of the Greeks, and for the *noſe*, which is *naſa*, the ſame with the Latin word *naſus*. There is another word which he has given me, a word of great importance, and which muſt have been as antient in every language as the religion of the country. It is the name of God in Shanſcrit, which is *Deva*, and is the θεος of the Greeks, and comes nearer to the *Deus* of the Latins,

Latins, whoſe cuſtom it was to change the aſperated Τ or Θ into the middle letter D.

And here the reader may obſerve, that as the Latin is the moſt antient dialect of the Greek, many of the words of the Shanſcrit have a greater reſemblance to the Latin than to the Greek. Thus, as I have obſerved before, the word *naſa*, denoting a *noſe*, is plainly Latin, but entirely different from the Greek word expreſſing that feature of the face, which is ῥιν. *Apa*, which in Shanſcrit ſignifies *water*, has the greateſt reſemblance to the Latin word *aqua*, but none at all to the Greek word ὑδωρ; and here is another word which muſt have been originally in all languages. And I ſhall only mention two words more, *veedhava*, in Shanſcrit, which is the *vidua* of the Latins, but is quite different from the Greek word χηρα; and *laka*, which is the Shanſcrit word for *locus*, but is quite different from the Greek word τοπος.

In theſe words the reader will obſerve, that there is a good deal of difference in the ſound betwixt the Greek and Latin words and the Shanſcrit: But there is nothing in language ſo changeable as the pronounciation of it, even in the ſame nation. But, when the language goes to a different nation, eſpecially to one at ſuch a diſtance as India is from Egypt, when there muſt be an intercourſe betwixt the two nations, ſuch as might preſerve, in ſome degree, the original pronunciation of the language, the change muſt be very great.

To the words which Mr Wilkins has given me, I will add ſome that are preſerved in Diodorus Siculus, and Arrian's *Indica*: And, as they are the names of places and perſons in India, when Alexander was there, they are undoubtedly very antient words of the Shanſcrit, as the names of perſons and places are the moſt antient words in all languages; they have, therefore, more of the Greek ſound

in

in them, than the words which Mr Wilkins has furnished me, being of an older dialect of the Shanscrit, as we may suppose, than those of Mr Wilkins, which are from the Shanscrit language as it is at present. The words are, Ταξιλα, the name of a Town in India*; Γλαυκοιναι, the name of a Nation in India†; Καθαιοι and Οξυδρακαι, names of Nations also ‡; Υδραωτης, the name of a River, and Ηιμπραωα, the name of a City‖; Μουσικανος, the name of a King in India §; Οξυδρακαι, the name of a Nation ¶; Αρμαστηλια, the name of a Town**; Υαλαι, the name of a City; Ωξιτη, the name of a country††; and Ωξιται, the name of the people of that country‡‡; Εμβολιμα, the name of a City‖‖; Υασπις and Υφασις, names of Rivers; Τοφανις, Ταφοσιρις, &c. Other words of the same kind might no doubt be found; but these, I think, are sufficient to show, that the names of places in India, the most antient words in all languages, were originally Egyptian words, the Greek being, as I have shown §§, a dialect of the Egyptian; which language being lost as well as the people, its affinity with the Indian can be no otherwise proved, than by the affinity of the Indian with the Greek, a dialect of the Egyptian still preserved. In short, there were, in antient times, so many Greek names of places and persons in India, that when I travel with Alexander through India, as his expedition is described by Diodorus Siculus and Arrian, I think I am travelling through Greece.

This may suffice, at present, to show the similarity both of the sound and the sense of the words of the two languages, though I know that a great many more words of the same kind might be pro-

* Arrian, p. 356. † Ibid. p. 380. ‡ Ibid. p. 385.
‖ Ibid. p. 386. § Ibid. p. 439. ¶ Diod. Siculus, lib. 17. cap. 98.
** Ibid. cap. 103. †† Arrian, p. 103. ‡‡ Diod. Siculus, cap. 104.
‖‖ Arrian, lib. 4. cap. 28. p. 329.
§§ Vol. I. of Origin of Language, book 3. chap. 13. 2d edition.

duced. And Mr Wilkins has given me a catalogue of about 70 more; but, as I expect he will ſtill give me more, I will not publiſh the catalogue he has given me till he has compleated it, which I hope he will do, and then either he or I ſhall publiſh it. In the mean time, I have collected from ſome other travellers in India, Shanſcrit words that are clearly Greek, ſuch as *gonia* the Shanſcrit word for an *angle*, *kentra* for a *centre*; and they uſe the word *hora* in the ſame ſenſe that it is uſed in Latin.

I come now to ſpeak of the reſemblance betwixt the two languages, in what I think of greater conſequence for proving them to have been originally the ſame language; I mean the art by which they are formed. The art of language, as I have obſerved, conſiſts of three things, Compoſition, Derivation, and Flection, by which the words of language are ſo connected together, both in ſound and ſenſe, that words, though of the greateſt number, amounting, as it is ſaid the words in Latin do, to five millions, may notwithſtanding be comprehended in the memory, and readily applied to uſe. Now, if it can be ſhown, that in theſe three great arts, there is a reſemblance betwixt the Shanſcrit and Greek, I think there is an end of the queſtion.

And, *firſt*, as to Compoſition, Mr Wilkins has ſhown me, as I have obſerved, that, in denoting numbers, they compound the word expreſſing *units* with the word expreſſing *ten*. And he told me of another compoſition, of the word denoting the number *three* with the word denoting *a foot*; for, ſays he, obſerving one day a three-footed ſtool in a Pagoda, on which a ſtatue was placed, I aſked the Bramin who was with me, what the name of it was in Shanſcrit, and he told me it was *tripada*. And in like manner they compound the word *danta*, ſignifying a *tooth*, with the ſame number *three*, and ſay *tridanta*, that is a *trident*.

But

But a more extraordinary compoſition in the Shanſcrit, than any I have hitherto mentioned, and which is the ſame in the Greek, and is ſo remarkable a peculiarity in both languages, that I think it is impoſſible it could exiſt, except in languages that were originally the ſame. The compoſition I mean is of words with the letter *a*, implying a negation of the quality expreſſed by the word, for which reaſon it is called, by the Greek grammarians, the *a privative*, ſuch as the words, ἀχρατος, ἀβλαβης, and hundreds of others. Now, I am told, not only by Mr Wilkins, but by others who have applied to the ſtudy of the Shanſcrit, particularly Mr Haſtings, who is not only a good Greek ſcholar, but learned in the Shanſcrit, that this compoſition is as common in that langu ge as it is in Greek.

As to Derivation, Mr Wilkins has afforded me no particular examples of this branch of the art of the Shanſcrit language, but as it is a more ſimple art than either compoſition or flection, I think it muſt abound in it as much as I ſhall ſhow it does in a more difficult part of the art, I mean flection. Mr Halhed, in the paſſage I have quoted from him, ſays, that it abounds in derivation as well as in compoſition and flection; and if it were not ſo, it could not deſerve the very high eulogium which Pons, the Jeſuit, has beſtowed upon it, which is, that it is ſo regularly formed from a few roots, that a man, who has made himſelf maſter of thoſe roots, and of the rules of its compoſition, derivation, and flection, may, from the roots, form himſelf a language, which will be underſtood by thoſe who are learned in the Shanſcrit, though it may differ from the language in common uſe*.

I come now to ſpeak of the *third* and greateſt art of language, in my opinion, I mean flection; by which, with a ſmall variation of the word, genders and numbers of nouns are expreſſed, alſo caſes are formed, by which the various relations, that the noun has to the

* See Vol. 26. of Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuſes.

other words in the ſentence, are ſignified: And in verbs, the time of the action with all its variety of preſent, paſt, and future, and compounds of theſe; alſo perſons and numbers, and likewiſe the diſpoſition of the mind of the ſpeaker, with reſpect to the action, affirming, wiſhing, or commanding it, are expreſſed. This wonderful art, Mr Halhed tells us, abounds in the Shanſcrit; and, as it is a more perfect language than the Greek, I imagine it excels the Greek in this greateſt art of language. The ſame Mr Halhed tells us, that the Bengaleſe language, which I hold to be no more than a corrupt dialect of the Shanſcrit, has a claſs of verbs that are conjugated in the ſame way, as the verbs in μι in Greek are. And Mr Wilkins has given me four perſons of the preſent tenſe of the ſubſtantive verb in the pure Shanſcrit, which is as follows: *Aſmee, I am; aſcee, thou art; aſtee, he is; ſantee, they are:* The three firſt of which are the Greek words εμι, εις, εστι; and the laſt is the *ſunt* of the Latins. And as the Shanſcrit reſembles the Greek and Latin ſo much in the flection of their verbs, we cannot, I think, doubt of its reſembling thoſe languages likewiſe in the flection of their nouns, and the other declinable parts of ſpeech.

Thus, I think, Mr Wilkins has done what no man before him has done; having proved by facts, from the compariſon of the two languages, that the Greek and Shanſcrit are dialects of the ſame language, the antient language of Egypt, as certainly, I think, as it is proved that the Engliſh, Swediſh, and Norwegian, are dialects of the Gothic; and which language of Egypt is thus proved to have been carried to India, as it is certain that the Indians never were in Egypt. And as ſeveral of the antient authors doubted of the Egyptians ever having been in India, and the learned Strabo poſitively denies it, I think the learned world has great obligations to Mr Wilkins for having eſtabliſhed ſo curious a fact, not only in the hiſtory of language, but in the hiſtory of man.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Language imported by Oſiris into India is ſtill preſerved under the name of the Shanſcrit.—It is the Sacred Language of India; now underſtood only by the Bramins.—It is to be preſumed, that the Language of Egypt, as it went as far as India, went alſo to the neighbouring countries.—But, beſides preſumption, there is proof from facts.—This furniſhed by M. Gebelin in his Monde Primitif. *—He, and Bullet in his Celtic Dictionary, maintain, that there was a primitive Language, from which all the other Languages on earth are derived.—That ſuch a Language did exiſt, M. Gebelin has proved, by comparing the ſeveral Languages in the world with one another,—the European, Aſiatic, and American, Languages compared together by him.—America peopled from the north eaſt parts of Aſia.—A curious fact related of a ſingular cuſtom of the Egyptians which the Americans have adopted.—The method which M. Gebelin has followed in making this compariſon, very proper, by finding out the radical words in the ſeveral Languages.—Of the difference of ſound of derivative words from their radicals in the ſame Language; but this difference much greater in different dialects of that Language. —An exact account, digeſted into tables, given by Gebelin, of the changes of derivative words from the original.—The change of vowels in the derivative Languages, not ſo great as of conſonants: —The reaſon for this.—But conſonants alſo changed.—This makes the difference ſo great betwixt the original and derivative Languages. —Of the monoſyllables of the Chineſe Language;—many of them to be found in other Languages, and particularly in the Coptic.—Thus proved, that there was a time when there was only one Language on the face*

face of the earth.—The author, before he read M. Gebelin, was of another opinion.—What that Language was M. Gebelin has not determined.—All the Languages of Europe, he ſays, are derived from the Celtic.—But the Celts did not invent their Language, nor the Goths theirs.—The Gothic a more perfect Language in ſome reſpect than the Latin.—Any nation ſpeaking a Language of art, only proves that the original Language came to them in greater perfection than to other nations.—The reſemblance betwixt the Celtic and other Languages, no proof that theſe Languages are derived from the Celtic.—The Greek Language was certainly not derived from the Celtic, but came directly from Egypt.—If the Greeks did not invent their Language, how can we ſuppoſe that the Celts or Goths did.—The progreſs of the formation of the Language of art, in Egypt, muſt have begun with words of one ſyllable.—In that way the Chineſe monoſyllabic Language is to be accounted for.—Theſe monoſyllabical words were the roots of the primitive Language.—A great queſtion, By what rule, or whether by any rule, theſe roots were formed.—The letters, according to M. Gebelin, are to be conſidered as a kind of roots.—The Author's opinion in this matter:—Nothing, even among men, done without ſome reaſon.—Many words formed from the ſound.—Even ideas may be expreſſed by a ſound, which is ſuppoſed to have ſome analogy to them.—The Shanſcrit, according to Father Pons, a moſt wonderful piece of art and ſcience.—It analyſes the particular ideas, expreſſed by the words, into the general ideas from which they ariſe.--Theſe expreſſed by monoſyllables, which are the roots of the Language.—Monoſyllables being the ſimpleſt words are the fitteſt for derivation and Compoſition.—From theſe roots, in long order and with great variety, are deduced, according to fixed and determinate rules, the words of the Shanſcrit, expreſſing the particular ideas, falling under the general ideas denoted by the roots.—Examples of this given by Pons the Jeſuit;--a knowledge of the roots, and of the Grammar of the Language, together with the rules of derivation

vation and compoſition, will enable a perſon to form a Language of his own, which will be underſtood by thoſe who know the art by which the Language is formed.—The Jeſuit Pons's account, of this Language, confirmed by Mr Wilkins.—This Language the work of philoſophers.—It may be compared to the Categories *of Archytas.—The Greek and Latin, though not ſo perfect as the Shanſcrit, wonderful works of art,—connecting by means of Derivation, Compoſition, and Flection, ſome millions of words.—Flection the greateſt of theſe.—Its wonderful effects in nouns and verbs.—In the Greek verb upwards of a thouſand variations.—M. Gebelin, though learned in languages, knew ſo little of the philoſophy of Language, as to maintain that men ſpeak naturally, and have from nature the ideas they expreſs by the words.—According to him, two perſons meeting, who had learned no Language, would hold communication together by ſpeech, and underſtand one another.—This the primitive Language of Gebelin:—According to him, all other arts, as well as Language, natural to men; and they have from the beginning the knowledge of aſtronomy, and of all the arts of life.—No natural ſtate according to Gebelin, the Savages, at preſent to be found, being men degenerated.—The Author's ſyſtem, from antient books, very different from Gebelin's;—though an admirer of Greek learning, and a reader of many books in that Language, M. Gebelin has not read their philoſophers, who would have taught him the progreſs of man from* capacity *to* energy.—*Without Greek philoſophy, no natural talents or application will avail.—Contradictions in Gebelin's ſyſtem;—it is refuted by the fact, of deaf perſons being likewiſe dumb, and being taught to ſpeak with great labour and much difficulty.—Even the moſt barbarous Language a work of art, if the words expreſs all the ideas of the ſpeaker, and are connected together.—Men, in the natural ſtate, without the uſe of ſpeech, are in the caſe of dumb men:—They could not teach themſelves:—But the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, who invented Language, muſt firſt have taught themſelves, and then others.—Progreſs of the art*

cver

even in Egypt.—The firſt words there monoſyllables.—The Language in that ſtate went to China:—When a Language of words of ſeveral ſyllables was invented, theſe monoſyllables were made the roots of the Language.—In this way the Shanſcrit was formed.—But the Chineſe have preſerved the Language, in monoſyllables, as they got it.—The great imperfection of that Language.—The queſtion, In what country Gebelin's primitive Language was invented?—It could be no where but in Egypt, where the Dæmon Kings reigned.—The Jews had no Language revealed to them,—no country in ſuch a ſtate of civility, when Oſiris went to India, that they could have invented the moſt barbarous Language.—Of the way the Egyptian Language was communicated to other nations, and how it came to be ſo barbarous as it was ſpoken by ſome nations.—It was conveyed to India by Oſiris, and by him depoſited in the hands of the Bramins, who have preſerved it with little or no corruption, but have not improved it.—It alſo went to Greece, but not in ſo great purity as to India,—was preſerved there by Homer and the other poets.—Next to the Greek Language, it is in the greateſt purity in the Celtic.—This proved by its reſemblance to the Latin,—and by the name of Shanſcrit *being a Celtic word.—Surpriſing that in ſome of the moſt barbarous Languages, a good deal of the art of the antient Egyptian Language ſhould be preſerved,—as in the Gothic;—even in the Language of Greenland there is a dual number.—How ſo many Languages, differing ſo much from one another, ſhould be all derived from one primitive Language, accounted for.—The variety made in the two Egyptian alphabets ſtill more wonderful.—Objection anſwered, that it was not conſiſtant with the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, to confine the invention of Language to one country.—That country ſufficient for the purpoſe.—The variety of the ſyſtem of nature did not admit that many countries ſhould be ſo well fitted for that purpoſe.—Objection, that all the people on earth have not learned the uſe of ſpeech, particularly the Orang Outangs.—But they*

may

may ſtill learn it, as ſome wild people in Ethiopia have done.—

IN the preceding chapter I think I have proved, both by arguments and facts, that Oſiris carried with him to India, among other arts, the art of language, which, as well as the polity he introduced into that country, is ſtill preſerved, under the name of the *Shanſcrit:*—That it is now their ſacred language, in which their moſt antient religious books are written, and is underſtood only by the Bramins, that is, the prieſts of India, though it appears to have been once the general language of the country;—and that this language could be no other than the language of antient Egypt.

Thus I think I have proved, that Egypt was not only the parent country of many other arts and of ſciences, but alſo of that firſt art among men, and the foundation of all other arts and ſciences, I mean the art of language; at leaſt that it was ſo with reſpect to India: And if it travelled as far as India, I think it may be preſumed that it went to the neighbouring countries in Africa, Aſia, and Europe. But, in the hiſtory I am giving of the origin of arts and ſciences, I would not have a matter of ſuch importance in that hiſtory, as the origin of an art, which, as I have ſaid, is the parent of all others, reſt upon mere preſumption and probability, and therefore I will try to prove by facts, that language came from Egypt to other countries, as well as to India. But before this can be done, it muſt be firſt proved that there is, or was, at ſome time or another, one original language, of which all the languages on earth are derivatives. But this is a ſubject where Mr Wilkins can give me no aſſiſtance, which I regret very much. I muſt therefore have recourſe to a French author, *M. Gebelin*, who has written a book entitled *Monde Primitif*, in nine volumes in quarto, in which

he has endeavoured to prove, that all the languages now in the world are derived from one language, which he calls the primitive language: For that there is or was ſuch a language, he lays down as a principle, in which he ſays many learned men agree with him; and there is one author, very learned in language, M. Bullet, who, in his Celtic Dictionary, has made a collection of many words from ſeveral languages that he mentions, which he ſays are words of this common language. But M. Gebelin has taken a much wider range, and has gone through not only all the languages of the old world, but even thoſe of the new; and has endeavoured to ſhew, that they have ſuch reſemblances, and are ſo connected with one another, that they muſt be all derived from one original, or primitive language. But where this original language was invented, or where it now is or ever was, neither he nor M. Bullet has ſaid. But that is not the queſtion at preſent, which is only whether ſuch an original language exiſts, or ever did exiſt in any country. Now this M. Gebelin has endeavoured to prove, by comparing together all the ſeveral languages I have mentioned, and which, indeed, are all the languages of the world. And I think he proceeds upon a principle which cannot be diſputed, that languages, which reſemble one another, not only in the ſound of the words, but in the ſenſe of them, muſt be all derived from one common language; for otherwiſe it is impoſſible to account for ſuch a conformity. This work, in which he compares with one another all the languages, antient or modern, that are known, is the greateſt work upon language that ever was undertaken; and, in executing it, he ſhews, I think, a wonderful knowledge of many languages, and alſo very good judgment in comparing them together. The reader, therefore, I hope, will think himſelf obliged to me, if I give him a ſummary view of it.

He not only examines the languages that are now ſpoken in Europe,

rope, or that were formerly ſpoken, ſuch as the Greek, Latin, Celtic, Gothic, and their ſeveral dialects; but the Aſiatic languages, ſuch as the Hebrew, Arabic, Phoenician, and Chaldean, and alſo the Malayſe language, and that ſpoken in the iſland of Madagaſcar. And he has gone to the eaſt as far as China; and he might have gone farther ſtill, even to Japan, betwixt the language of which and the Teutonic, a late German writer has diſcovered a great reſemblance. And he has not confined himſelf to the old world, but has croſſed the Atlantic, and gone, as I have ſaid, to the weſt, and examined the ſeveral languages ſpoken in the different provinces of North and South America, and alſo in the iſlands of the South Sea *.

As to America, I am convinced that it was peopled from the north-eaſt parts of Aſia, from which it is at preſent divided by a very narrow ſea, full of ſmall iſlands, which look like ſtepping-ſtones between the two continents. And I think there is reaſon to believe that there was a time when they were not divided at all by any ſea: For there is a French author, M. le Page du Pratz, whom I have mentioned elſewhere †, who travelled a good deal in North America, and in his travels met with an Indian, who had travelled in that country much more than he, and who told him that he had met with an old Indian who, in his youth, had known an old man that had ſeen the two continents joined ‡: So that the ſea appears to have made an irruption there, and to have ſeparated the two continents, in the ſame manner as it ſeparated Sicily from Italy, of which the name of the town in Italy, built upon the ſtrait, was a memorial; for it was called *Reggium*, a word which in Greek, denotes *burſting* or *breaking*. I think it is probable that Britain was ſeparated from France in the ſame manner;

* Vol. 8th, p 489. and following. † Vol. 3. of this work, p. 53.

‡ P. 303. of the Hiſtory of Louiſiana, by M. le Page du Pratz.

and undoubtedly many ſuch changes have happened on this earth, of land into water, and alſo of water into land *.

The Aſiatics, who peopled America from the north-eaſt parts, as I have ſaid of Aſia, would undoubtedly carry their language with them, and did ſo, as it appears, to the moſt northerly parts of America: For it is now diſcovered, that there is a very great affinity betwixt the language of the Kamſchatkans, who inhabit thoſe north-eaſt parts of Aſia, and the language of the Eſquimeaux; and there is alſo a great reſemblance in their cuſtoms and manners, and likewiſe in their faces and perſons. The language, thus brought into America, muſt, according to my hypotheſis, have come originally from Egypt: And with it there is come into North America a very ſingular cuſtom of the Egyptians, as it is remarked by Herodotus, and which was peculiar to them; I mean the cuſtom of the men making water ſitting, and the women ſtanding. This is the univerſal cuſtom among the North American Indians, as Mr Adair, in his hiſtory of the American Indians, has told us †. And he has told us in the ſame place, that he was informed that it was alſo the cuſtom in Mexico. Now this author was longer in America than I believe any European ever was, who returned to Europe; for he was forty years in that country; and, as he was a trader with the Indians, was very much among them, not only in the way of buſineſs, but often in their parties of pleaſure, and ſometimes in their campaigns. He therefore had an opportunity of being very well informed of the facts which he relates, eſpecially a fact of this kind falling under common

* See, upon this ſubject, Strabo, Lib. 1. towards the middle; where there is a very curious account given of the ſeveral changes that have happened in different countries, by Inundations and Earthquakes.—See alſo upon the ſame ſubject, Sheringhame, *De Anglorum Origine.*

† Page 216.

common obſervation. Nor can we ſuſpect him of any intention to impoſe upon the reader with reſpect to this fact. If indeed he had maintained that the Indians of North America were deſcended of the Egyptians, and came from that country, he might be ſuppoſed to have feigned this fact, in order to ſupport his ſyſtem, if he had known, what I do not believe he did, that this was a peculiar cuſtom of the Egyptians. But his hypotheſis, which he has endeavoured to maintain by many arguments, is, that theſe Indians were a colony of Jews, which came off about the time that their city was taken by Nebuchadnezar, and themſelves tranſported to Babylon. Now, among the Jews, it is well known that the men piſſed as we do in Europe; and accordingly, *piſſing againſt the wall*, is, in the language of the Old Teſtament, made a characteriſtical mark of the male ſex.

This circumſtance may appear trifling to many of my readers; but I think it tends not a little to ſupport my ſyſtem of the languages of theſe Indians in North America being derived from Egypt, as well as every other language: For it proves, that the men, who from Kamſchatka peopled America, muſt have had ſome communication with the Egyptians, not immediately, I believe, but by the intercourſe of other nations. And when they adopted this ſingular cuſtom of the Egyptians, I muſt ſuppoſe that they alſo learned their language.

In making this wonderful inveſtigation, M. Gebelin has followed, I think, a very proper method: For he has endeavoured to diſcover the radical words in the ſeveral languages he examines; which he ſuppoſes, very juſtly, muſt have been words of the primitive language. Nor indeed could the reſemblance betwixt ſo many different languages have otherwiſe been clearly made out; for we know, that derivative and compounded words differ very much in

found

found from the original; and very often the analogy of the ſenſe is not very evident. For this purpoſe our author has compiled ſeveral etymological dictionaries, particularly a French one, a Latin, and a Greek, wherein he has ranged the words according to their ſeveral *families*, as he calls them. And though ſome of his etymologies may be conjectural and fanciful, yet, upon the whole, he has made ſuch a ſyſtem of theſe languages as never was made before; for it is only by reducing the words of a language to a few roots, from which all the other words proceed, that we can make a ſyſtem of any language. And it is to be obſerved, that in the etymological dictionaries of the languages I have mentioned, he has found almoſt all the roots in other European languages, ſuch as the Celtic, or in the Oriental languages, ſuch as the Hebrew and Arabic; for as all thoſe languages, of which he has given us etymological dictionaries, are derived from the other languages I have mentioned, it is of neceſſity that a great part of the roots ſhould be found in theſe other languages. Theſe, therefore, muſt be the parent languages of the Greek, Latin, and French. But ſtill the difficulty recurs, From whence were the Celtic, Hebrew, and Arabic derived? and M. Gebelin anſwers, From his *Primitive Language*, to which, as I have obſerved, he has not aſſigned a country; but this defect, I hope, I have ſupplied, and have proved that country to have been Egypt.

Another thing to be obſerved of thoſe derivative languages, is, that the words in them, derived from the original language, muſt be much altered from their roots in the ſound. Even in words derived from the roots of the ſame language, we obſerve a great change in the ſound, which is very obſervable in the Greek and Latin derivatives, in which the difference is ſometimes ſo great, that it requires a great deal of knowledge of etymology to find out the root. But when the words are derived from another language, the change muſt be very much greater; for when a language is brought from another

another nation, living, as it often happens, in a different climate, and therefore with organs of pronunciation different, and ſo pronouncing the ſame letters differently, the change in the language muſt be very great.

Of theſe changes of words brought from other languages, or of derivatives in the ſame language from their radicals, he has given us, in his third volume *, ſix tables, containing the ſeveral changes of vowels into vowels, or vowels into conſonants, and of additions made to the ſame word, or diminutions of it; and in theſe tables he has taken his examples both from the languages of Europe, antient and modern, and from the Oriental languages. As to vowels, he has obſerved, very properly †, that the vowels change more eaſily into one another than the conſonants. And indeed if we conſider, that the vowels, as I have obſerved in another place ‡, are nothing more than a certain modification of the breath, by which the conſonants are pronounced, it is no wonder that the vowels ſhould be changed into one another; or, in other words, that the conſonants ſhould be pronounced by a different modification of the breath: Whereas the conſonants articulate the vowels, and make language of them, which, without them, would be nothing elſe but vocal ſounds. The changes, therefore, of conſonants into one another, make a much greater difference in the language, than the changes of vowels, though the difference be not ſo great when conſonants of the ſame organ are changed into one another, as B into P, or M or F into V, which are all labial conſonants: And accordingly, in the different dialects of the ſame language, they are frequently uſed one for the other, of which our author gives many examples. And when to theſe changes, the other changes he mentions are

* P. 152, and following.

† Ibid. p. 151.

‡ P. 111. of this vol.

are added, it is no wonder that the reſemblance of different languages to one another, and ſpoken by people at ſuch a diſtance from one another, as the people of Europe are from thoſe of Aſia and America, ſhould be ſo difficult to be diſcovered. The Chineſe language is ſo different from all other languages we know, that one ſhould think it was impoſſible to find any reſemblance betwixt it and thoſe other languages. But M. Gebelin has found out a reſemblance that is really wonderful betwixt their monoſyllables, and the languages of Europe and Aſia *. And it is the more wonderful, that their monoſyllables are very different from the ſyllables in thoſe other languages: For they never terminate their ſyllables with any conſonants except the naſal conſonants M and N; and ſome conſonants they have no uſe of at all;—So that I think the example of the Chineſe language ſerves to ſupport our author's ſyſtem more than that of any other language. And there is an obſervation made by M. de Guignes, in the treatiſe he has written, to prove that the Chineſe were originally a colony from Egypt, which is not taken notice of by our author, but which tends very much to ſupport my ſyſtem of the Egyptian language being the original primitive lan-

language, more than the examples from any other language; and it is this, that the language of the Copts, which is the only remains to be found in Egypt of the antient language of that country, there are a great many Chineſe monoſyllables to be found.

And thus, I think, our author has proved by facts, what from theory I have been of a great while diſpoſed to believe, that originally there was but one language upon earth. But my knowledge of different languages was not ſo great as to enable me to prove it by facts; and accordingly I have concluded the firſt volume of the Origin of Language, with giving my opinion, that all languages were

* Vol. 3. p. 367.

were not derived from one language, invented in one country; though I had then diſcovered, that all the languages of Europe, antient and modern, and the languages ſpoken in the weſtern parts of Aſia, and in a part of Africa, were all originally the ſame language, and which was the antient language of Egypt *. But then I did not know that this antient language was ſtill preſerved in India, and that the Greek was a dialect of it, though I thought there was good reaſon to believe that the Greeks had got from Egypt their language as well as their other arts. Neither did I know any thing of the Chineſe language, or that it was poſſible to make out any connection betwixt it and the languages of Europe, or the oriental languages, ſuch as the Hebrew and Greek. And as to the languages of the new world, or the iſlands lately diſcovered in the South Sea, I did not think it was poſſible that there could be any reſemblance betwixt them and the languages of Europe, or thoſe of the weſtern parts of Aſia. But Mr Gebelin has now diſcovered this connection. And as to languages ſo barbarous as the hiſſing language of Troglodytes in Abyſſinia; or the muttering jargon of thoſe ſavages, mentioned by Condamine, on the banks of the river Amazons, ſpoken, as he ſays, by drawing in the breath; or the language of the Hottentots, and the people lately diſcovered by a French traveller to the weſt of New Mexico, who ſupply the defects of their articulation by ſmacks;—I take the caſe to have been, as I have elſewhere mentioned †, that they had had but very little intercourſe with the people who ſpoke the original language, only enough to form the idea of articulation, and to learn, perhaps, ſome few words of it. It is therefore to M. Gebelin that I owe this great diſcovery in the hiſtory of man; and I am now fully convinced of the truth of what Moſes has told us, that time was when there was only one language and one ſpeech upon the earth; which I was diſpoſed to

* See the three laſt chapters of vol. 1ſt, of Origin of Language, ſecond edit.

† Vol. 1. p. 663. ſecond edition.

believe upon the authority of Moſes, but could not reconcile it with facts, thinking that it applied only to the languages in the weſtern parts of Aſia.

But our author has not explicitly told us what this primitive univerſal language is, where it was invented, where it is to be found, or whether it now exiſts. He has told us, indeed, that the Greek and Latin, and all the languages ſpoken at preſent in Europe, are derived from the Celtic; but he has no where ſaid that the Celtic is not itſelf a derivative from ſome other language: Or if he had ſaid it, I ſhould not have believed him; for the Celts, though a very warlike people, were certainly not a people of arts and ſciences, and therefore not capable of inventing the language they ſpoke, any more than the Goths were capable of inventing their language, which, as it is preſerved in Iceland, is a more perfect language than the Celtic, having what the Celtic has not, nor any language ſpoken at preſent in Europe, and which I think one of the greateſt arts of language; I mean caſes of nouns formed by flection: And in ſeveral reſpects it is a more perfect language than even the Latin; for we are not to ſuppoſe that becauſe a people ſpeak a language of art, therefore they invented it, otherwiſe we muſt ſuppoſe that the Greenlanders invented their language, which has a dual number, and a firſt and ſecond future*, as well as the Greek. The fact truly is, that this primaeval language, which I ſay was invented in Egypt, was a language of the greateſt art, as we may judge by what is preſerved of it in India. And this language was ſpread all over the earth: But it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe, that to every country it was tranſported in the ſame degree of perfection that it was ſpoken in Egypt. I am perſuaded it has ſuffered leſs in India, than in

* This information I had from an acquaintance of mine, whom I mentioned before, Mr Thorkelin, who has told me a great many other curious particulars of that language, having ſtudied a grammar of it, which is publiſhed.

in any other country to which it was carried, being preſerved there, as a precious depoſit, in the hands of a body of men more reſembling the prieſts of Egypt, who certainly ſpoke it in the greateſt purity, than any other body of men now in the world. No other nation, I am perſuaded, got it in ſuch purity as the Indians did; or if they had got it, they could not have preſerved it ſo pure, not having among them ſuch a ſociety of men as the Bramins of India. And my wonder is, that ſo much of it has been preſerved in ſome nations, and particularly among the Goths, who have always been reckoned a barbarous nation; nor is it, I think, at all to be wondered, that ſo little of it has come to other nations, or has been preſerved among them.

As to the Celtic, it is no doubt true that the Greek and Latin, the Oriental languages, and all the languages now ſpoken in Europe, have a great connection with it. But this does not prove that all theſe languages are derived from it, but only that they all came off from the ſame common ſtock: And particularly as to the Greek, we are ſure that it came directly from Egypt, being imported by the Egyptian colonies who ſettled there, and by the governing men who came with them, ſuch as Cecrops, who no doubt would bring with them their language, as well as their other Egyptian arts*. Now, if the Grecks, who were certainly a moſt ingenious people, and appear to have cultivated arts and ſciences very much, even in early times, did not invent their own language, how can we ſuppoſe that a barbarous people, ſuch as the Celts and the Goths, invented theirs. It is evident, therefore, I think, that they muſt have got their language from Egypt, as well as the Grecks, though I believe not ſo directly and immediately, but through the channel of other nations.

* See upon this ſubject what I have ſaid in the 13th chap. of book 3d of vol. I. of the Origin of Language, where I think I have removed every ſhadow of doubt concerning the origin of the Greek language being from Egypt.

The Celts were certainly a very antient nation, more antient in Europe than the Goths, who did not come to the northern parts of Europe from the Tauric Cherſoneſe, now called Crim Tartary, under their leader Odin, till about the time of Julius Cæſar. And, they were a much more numerous nation than the Goths; for they inhabited all Gaul, Britain, Ireland, and a great part of Spain, and alſo of Italy. I think, therefore, it is likely, that they got the language of Egypt more early than the Goths or any other European nation, except the Greeks, who, as I have juſt now ſaid, learned the Egyptian language from the Egyptian colonies that were ſettled among them. I think, too, it is probable, that, from the Celts, the language of Egypt was propagated to many other nations. This, I think, M. Buliet has made evident in his Celtic Dictionary, where he has ſhown, that the words of the Celtic are likewiſe words of a wonderful number of other languages, ſuch as the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, Saxon, &c. And there is one word he mentions, and a capital word in all languages, I mean the name of *Man*, which he has ſhown to be a word, not only in all the languages of Europe, but in the Perſian, the Turkiſh, the Mogul languages, and even in the oldeſt dialect of Greek, I mean the Latin, where one ſhould hardly expect to find it. But it is there, not indeed by itſelf, but in compoſition, in the word *Mancipium*, which ſignifies a man that is taken and made a ſlave of *. And, I think, it is likely, that the Celts muſt have ſeen ſome antient writing of the Egyptian language, called by the name we uſe to denote it, and which I underſtand to be the name which the Bramins give it, I mean *Shanſcrit*, which, in the dialect of the Celtic, that is at this day ſpoken in the Highlands of Scotland, denotes *antient writing*. And as it is the name given by the Bramins to their language, I am perſuaded it is an Egyptian word.

Thus,

* See the Celtic Dictionary, tom. 3. p. 133.

Thus, I think, I have proved, that there was once upon the earth but one language, from which all the languages that are now ſpoken, or were ſpoken in antient times, are derived. If the reader is not yet ſatisfied, concerning this original language, by what I have ſaid of the ſimilarity betwixt ſo many different languages, I can direct him to books, where the ſimilitude, betwixt particular languages, is demonſtrated to be ſuch as could not happen by accident. There is particularly Sheringhame, *De Anglorum Origine*, from p. 99. to 110. where he has proved a wonderful likeneſs betwixt the Welch and Greek languages. And the ſame author, in the ſame work, p. 359. has proved a ſurpriſing conformity betwixt the Saxon language and the Greek: And, as I have ſaid *, there is a late German writer, who has diſcovered a great affinity betwixt the Teutonic, and the language of Japan. If the reader is not ſatisfied with all theſe authorities, I would have him read what I have written in vol. 1. of the Origin of Language †, where I have ſaid a good deal of the migration of languages from one country to another, and particularly of the Celtic, which not only ſpread itſelf over the greateſt part of Europe, but found its way to the north-eaſt parts of Aſia, and even to America.

Thus, I think, I have proved the opinion of M. Bullet and Gebelin, that there was once an original and primitive language, from which

* Page 339.

† Book 3. chap. 12. p. 587. and following, of 2d edition. In this chapter, (p. 585.) it is obſerved that language is the moſt laſting of all the memorials of men; and of the language itſelf, the names of places are more laſting than any other words of the language; for they are preſerved when the language itſelf is no longer a living language, nor preſerved in any written monuments. In this way I have ſaid that the Celtic is preſerved in France and Spain, and I might have added in England and the low country of Scotland, where the Celtic language has long ceaſed to be ſpoken or written. And I obſerve that M. Bullet has very properly made uſe of the ſimilarity of names of places, in proving languages, that are now very different, to have been originally the ſame.

which all the languages, that now are, or ever were, upon earth, are derived. This, I think, is of itſelf a very great diſcovery, in the hiſtory of arts and ſciences, and of man. But if it be likewiſe true, what I have endeavoured to prove, that the native country of this original language was Egypt, and that it was the parent country of other arts and of ſciences; I think, I may ſay, that I have compleated the hiſtory of arts and ſciences, which I think a moſt important part of the hiſtory of man, as it is by theſe he is made an intellectual creature in *actuality*, and not in *capacity* only, as he was in his natural ſtate.

As there muſt have been a progreſs in the art of language, as well as in other arts, and I believe a longer and more difficult progreſs than in any other, I will here obſerve the firſt ſtep in the formation of a language of art. Men, when they firſt began to ſpeak, would naturally draw out the articulate ſounds they had learned to a great length, reſembling their animal cries before they had learned to articulate, and which we know is the caſe at this day of the barbarous languages. But when they began to form a language of art, it was natural that they ſhould firſt make words of one ſyllable, before they made words of two or more; for the progreſs of all arts is from what is ſimple to what is complex. And this firſt beginning of a language of art, is, as I have elſewhere obſerved*, ſtill preſerved in China, being imported to that country from Egypt, before it was there brought to perfection. And this, I think, is the only way that ſo extraordinary a phenomenon, as the Chineſe language is, can be accounted for; for I do not think that, imperfect as it is, it could have been invented by the Chineſe themſelves, who are, I believe, what Dr Warburton calls them, a dull uninventive people. And as M. de Guignes has proved that they got their hieroglyphical or ſymbolical writing from Egypt,

* Vol. 6th of Origin of Language, p. 108. See alſo what I have ſaid, p. 276 of this volume.

Egypt, I think it is to be preſumed, that from thence they got likewiſe their language.

And here a curious queſtion occurs: By what rule, or whether by any rule, thoſe firſt monoſyllabical words, which I agree, with M. Gebelin, were the roots of the primitive language, and conſequently of every language derived from it, were formed? And M. Gebelin is of opinion, that thoſe roots were not names given by chance to things, but that there was a reaſon why one ſyllable was employed to expreſs a certain thing rather than another; and the reaſon, he ſays, was ſome reſemblance betwixt the ſound of the word, and the thing expreſſed by it. And he is at great pains to ſhew, that there is not only in the compoſition of letters making ſyllables, but in every ſingle letter, an expreſſion of ſome idea, ſenſation, ſentiment, or feeling, of one kind or another; ſo that he makes even of ſingle letters a kind of roots.

As to my opinion in this matter, I ſo far agree with M. Gebelin, that I believe man does hardly any thing by mere chance; and that the maxim of Mr Leibnitz's Philoſophy, That there is a reaſon for every thing, will apply to the works of man as well as to the works of nature, in ſo far that man does nothing without a reaſon, though very often not a good or ſufficient reaſon, but ſuch as moves him to act. I likewiſe agree with him, that there are many words, I believe, in all languages, which expreſs, by their ſounds, the things ſignified by them, ſuch as the words *craſh*, *gurgle*, *roar*, and many other in Engliſh. And further, I think that not only corporeal things, perceived by the ſenſes, may be ſo expreſſed, but alſo the ideas and ſentiments of the mind, may likewiſe be denoted by ſounds which have ſome analogy to them. And accordingly we may obſerve, that in Engliſh, and I believe in all languages, the words denoting the operations of the mind, are metaphors taken from

from the actions of body, ſuch as *weigh*, *ponder*, *reflect*, *proſpect*, *retroſpect*, &c. And in this way M. Gebelin thinks that the letters, or a certain compoſition of them, have an analogy to the ideas and ſentiments of the mind, as well as to the objects perceived by our ſenſes. Nor is M. Gebelin ſingular in this opinion; for Plato, in the *Cratylus*, has maintained the ſame doctrine; but for my part I think that there is ſo much fancy and conjecture in this matter, and ſo little certainty, that I do not chuſe to ſay any thing more concerning it, except that I think it ſhews language not to be a natural operation, as many ſuppoſe it to be, and among others M. Gebelin himſelf, but a work of the greateſt art, ſo great, that we are not able to give a ſatisfactory account of the firſt principles of it, I mean the formation of the radical ſounds, or firſt words of it.

And here I return again to the Shanſcrit language, which, according to the account given by Father Pons the Jeſuit, who was a miſſionary in India, is a moſt wonderful piece of art, and of ſcience too; for it analyſes all the particular ideas expreſſed by the words, into the general ideas from which they ariſe: And theſe are expreſſed by monoſyllables, which are the roots of the language; for M. Gebelin is certainly in the right, when he ſays, that the roots of the primitive language muſt have been all monoſyllables, which are the ſimpleſt words, and therefore beſt fitted for derivation and compoſition. From theſe roots are deduced, in long order and with great variety, but aſcertained by fixed and determinate rules, all the ſeveral words of the language, expreſſing particular ideas, which fall under the general ideas denoted by the roots. And he gives an example of this in the monoſyllable *kru*, which denotes the general idea of *action*; and from it are formed, by derivation and compoſition, all the words, of number no doubt very great, expreſſing the different kinds of action. And in this way, he ſays, if you are poſſeſſed of the roots of the language, and the rules of derivation and com-

compoſition obſerved in it, you may form a language of your own, which, though different from the common language, will be very well underſtood by thoſe who know the art by which the language is formed. This account, given by the Jeſuit, agrees perfectly with what Mr Wilkins told me of the formation of the language, which he learned both from the Bramins, who taught him the language, and from a grammar of it that is in his poſſeſſion. I will only add, that a language of ſuch art, muſt have been the work of philoſophers, who know that all ſciences begin with analyſis, by which we riſe to general principles, and from theſe deſcend to particulars. And there is one of the greateſt works of ſcience, to which, I think, the Shanſcrit language may fitly be compared: The work I mean is, that upon the Categories by Archytas, the Pythagorean philoſopher, and after him by Ariſtotle; for, in that work, all the ideas of the human mind are reduced to certain general ideas, called Categories, from which all our particular, or leſs general, ideas, are deduced.

But even the Greek and Latin, though languages not near ſo perfect as the Shanſcrit, are wonderful works of art, when we conſider, that by means of derivation, compoſition, and flection, they contrive to connect together five millions of words, (the number of words in the Latin language according to Biſhop Wilkins), ſo that they may be comprehended in the memory and readily applied to uſe. Of theſe three great arts of language, the greateſt, as I have obſerved *, is flection, by which, in nouns, not only genders and numbers are denoted, but the relations of things to one another are expreſſed by the caſes: And, by the conjugation of verbs, not only perſons and numbers are expreſſed, but time and almoſt every circumſtance of the action; which makes ſuch variations in the flection of the verb, and of its participles, that it is computed, a ſingle Greek verb produces more than 1000 words.

* Page 346.

Before I conclude this chapter, in which I have beſtowed ſo much praiſe on M. Gebelin, and, I think, ſo juſtly, I cannot help obſerving, that it appears to me very ſurpriſing, that a man ſo learned, as he is, in ſo many different languages, ſhould know ſo little of the philoſophy of language, as to maintain, that men have not only from nature the organs of ſpeech, but that they ſpeak naturally, as naturally as they breath; and that they have from nature, alſo the ideas which they expreſs by words, and, that the words are ſo much the natural ſigns of thoſe ideas, that they are immediately underſtood by thoſe who hear them: So that two men meeting together, who had learned no language, could communicate together by ſpeech, and underſtand one another perfectly well. And this natural language is what he calls the primitive language *.

If this account of the origin of language be true, I ſee no reaſon why every art may not have been practiſed by man, without teaching or uſe, as well as this moſt difficult art of language. And, accordingly, our author has ſaid †, that men, from the beginning, knew the principles of aſtronomy and the ſolar year: And he thinks, that men were, in the very beginning of their exiſtence upon this earth, perfect in all the arts of life; ſo that what is commonly called the natural ſtate, never had any exiſtence; though he does not deny, that men at this day are to be found in a very ſavage and barbarous ſtate: But, ſays he, thoſe men are degenerated from what they were originally; and the reaſon of this degeneracy, he ſays, has been conqueſt, tyranny, and oppreſſion ‡.

How different this ſyſtem of human nature is from that which I have delivered upon the authority of antient books, muſt be evident to every reader; and, indeed, it appears to me to be ſo repugnant, not

* Vol. 3. p. 70. and following.

† Vol. 8. p. 34. ‡ Ibid. p. 16.

not only to philoſophy, but to common ſenſe and obſervation, that to argue againſt it would be time very idly ſpent. The author has profeſſed himſelf a great admirer of the Greek learning‖; but he appears to have carried the ſtudy of that learning no farther (which is the caſe of very many Greek ſcholars) than the underſtanding of the language, and the reading many of the books in it. But he has not carried it to what I hold to be the perfection of the Greek learning, that is, their philoſophy. From it he might have learned, that man is by nature a creature only capable of intellect, and conſequently only capable of arts and ſciences; and that the hiſtory of man is an account of his progreſſion from a ſtate of mere capacity, to a ſtate of energy and actuality. And the example of this author convinces me more and more, that no man without antient philoſophy, whatever his natural talents or application may be, (in neither of which, I think, M. Gebelin is deficient), can underſtand the principles of any art or ſcience, not even of language, nor be ſo much a philoſopher, as to underſtand the philoſophy, or even the hiſtory of his own ſpecies.

This language of M. Gebelin, which may be called a language of inſtinct, like the cries of the brute animals, by which they communicate with one another their appetites and deſires, and which are perfectly underſtood among themſelves, is what our author calls the primitive original language. When I firſt began to read his work, I underſtood his ſyſtem to be, that this had been the original language of every nation; and that the languages now ſpoken were that language, but with thoſe changes and variations, which length of time muſt introduce into every language; and, indeed, I think, this is the natural conſequence of his ſyſtem. But, upon a farther peruſal of his work, I find, that he agrees with the common opinion, that one language is derived from another. And, accordingly,

‖ Vol. 9. in the beginning.

he makes the Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Sclavonic, to be all derived from the Celtic *. How far this is agreeable with the reſt of his ſyſtem, I leave the reader to judge.

But there is no need to ſhow contradictions in his ſyſtem, or to confute it by arguments; for there is a fact very well known, which at once puts an end to it. The fact I mean is, that deaf men are likewiſe dumb, and cannot articulate not only words of ſeveral ſyllables, but not even monoſyllabical words, of which, M. Gebelin ſays, that the primitive language conſiſted. They cannot, therefore, pronounce the firſt elements of ſpeech; yet they have the organs of pronunciation, ſuch as we have that are not deaf. And, accordingly, they may be taught to ſpeak, though with great labour and much difficulty, and even to ſpeak well; for I heard a female ſcholar, of the Abbe de l'Epe, in Paris, ſpeak ſo well, and ſo fluently, (not with that heſitation and frequent ſtops with which I have heard Mr Braidwood's ſcholars ſpeak), that I could hardly diſtinguiſh her ſpeaking from that of any other perſon. And the reaſon why there is ſo much difficulty in teaching them, is, that they have not the ſenſe of hearing, ſo as to learn to ſpeak by imitation, as our children do. Now, what muſt be learned either by teaching or imitation, is certainly a thing of art and not of nature.

But I have ſpent too much time (the reader, I am perſuaded, will think) in explaining this very extraordinary ſyſtem, which I believe no author before M. Gebelin maintained. And I will conclude my account of his work, with obſerving, how very difficult the invention of language muſt have been, not only of a language of art, ſuch as the Shanſcrit, Greek, or Latin, but of the moſt barbarous languages, expreſſing only the ideas of the ſpeaker, and connecting thoſe ideas together ſome way or other, however imperfect, but without

* Vol. 9. p. 206.

without which there can be no ſpeech. Men in the natural ſtate without the uſe of ſpeech, or having ever heard it pronounced, are preciſely in the caſe of dumb men. Now, can we conceive, that ſuch men, though they have the organs of ſpeech as perfect as other men, and accordingly may be taught to uſe them, but with much labour and difficulty, ſhould be able to teach themſelves. The reader, therefore, will not be ſurpriſed, that all along, in the courſe of this work, I have ſuppoſed that language could not be invented without ſupernatural aſſiſtance; and, accordingly, I have maintained, that it was the invention of the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, who, being more than men, firſt taught themſelves to articulate, and then taught others. But, even among them, I am perſuaded, there was a progreſs in the art, and that ſuch a language as the Shanſcrit was not at once invented. They, therefore, began with articulating only monoſyllables; and when the language was in that rude ſtate, it was conveyed through the channel of India to China. But when a language of art was formed in Egypt, and words of many ſyllables were invented, a proper uſe was made of thoſe monoſyllables; for they were made the roots of the language, from which, by derivation, compoſition, and flection, ſo wonderful a work of art, as the Shanſcrit, was formed. But the Chineſe, wanting thoſe Dæmons of Egypt to teach them, and being deficient alſo in genius and natural parts, have kept the language in the ſame infantine ſtate they got it from Egypt; which is ſo imperfect, that, as I have obſerved*, they uſe it in no matter of ſcience, not even in law and the adminiſtration of juſtice: And even in private converſation, about the ordinary affairs of life, they often cannot make themſelves underſtood without ſigns and geſtures; and ſometimes they are obliged to have recourſe to their written language.

M. Gebelin having eſtabliſhed, as I think he has done, that there muſt be ſome primitive language from which all the other languages in

* Page 107.

in the world are derived, the only queſtion that remains to be conſidered is, In what country this language was invented? And, I think, it is evident, that it muſt have been in Egypt, for, as it could not have been invented without ſupernatural aſſiſtance, which the Egyptians had from their Dæmon Kings, what other country beſides Egypt had ſuch Kings. The Jews were no doubt aſſiſted by God in eſtabliſhing religion, government, and laws, and were conducted by him, through the greateſt dangers, into the promiſed land, which they conquered by the miracles he wrought in their favour. But it is no where ſaid, that he interpoſed to give them a language, nor indeed was there any neceſſity for ſuch an interpoſition, as they had got a language from Egypt. But, ſuppoſing no ſuch ſupernatural aſſiſtance neceſſary for the invention of language, there was no nation on earth in ſuch a ſtate of civility, (at ſo early a period, as when Oſiris went to India, and when language in Egypt had been, as I have ſaid, invented), that they could have invented even the moſt barbarous, much leſs a language of ſuch art as he carried with him to India.

From Egypt it was propagated all over the earth. For language, as I have elſewhere obſerved, is an art of eaſy communication, as far at leaſt as regards the articulation of it, to an animal ſo imitative as man, eſpecially by the voice; and in that way it was communicated to moſt nations. For the moſt barbarous of them, hearing the Egyptians ſpeak, or any other nation that had learned from them, would naturally imitate the articulate ſounds; and, having got ſome of them with the ſenſe annexed to them, and, at the ſame time, having formed a habit of articulating, they, with theſe few words, would make a language of their own, in imitation of the articulate ſounds they had learned. And this, I think, is a very natural account of the many barbarous languages that have been derived from this ſo perfect language. But the Shanſcrit I hold to have been conveyed to India by Oſiris, in great purity,

purity, with not only the ſound and ſenſe of the words preſerved, but alſo the whole art of the language; and it was depoſited there in the hands of the Bramins or Prieſts, an order which he had inſtituted, by whom it has been preſerved till now, I will not ſay in perfect purity, but I believe very little corrupted. But, that it was improved by them, I cannot believe, from what I have heard of them from Mr Wilkins, who tells me, that they are not at all of an inventive genius, and can only preſerve, in their memories, what they have learned from their books or their anceſtors, and not very well explain even that. Next to the Indians, the Greeks appear to have got it in the greateſt purity; and it was preſerved among them by their poets, who were their firſt writers, and firſt cultivators of arts and ſciences. Among the antient writers of Greece, Homer holds the firſt rank; and, if his poems were to be diligently compared with the Shanſcrit, there would, I am perſuaded, be found in them more of that language than in any other Greek book. It was his writings which preſerved the Egyptian language from being as much corrupted in Greece as it was among the common people of India: For the ſeveral dialects of the Greek language, I hold to have been all derived from his poems, not his poems from theſe dialects, as many poeple abſurdly ſuppoſe.

The Celts, as I have elſewhere obſerved*, are a very antient people, and were once very wide ſpread all over Europe: They got, therefore, I am perſuaded, the Egyptian language more early than any other European nation except the Greek, who, as I have ſaid, learned it from the Egyptian colonies that were ſettled among them. And, I think, it is probable, that, from the Celts, the language was propagated to many other nations. And the Celts, themſelves, appear to have preſerved it very carefully: For their language has a very great reſemblance to the Latin dialect of the Greek; and I was told, by a man, who ſeemed to underſtand it very well, that the

* Page 348.

the firſt line of Virgil's Æneid was all Celtic words, except the proper name of *Troja*; and, as I have obſerved in the paſſage laſt quoted, the word *Shanſcrit*, which is the name given by the Bramins to their language, denotes, in the dialect of Celtic ſpoken in the Highlands of Scotland, *antient writing*.

To theſe obſervations I will add one more. It may at firſt ſight appear very ſurpriſing, that there ſhould be ſo many languages, I do not know how many hundreds, all different from one another, and yet all derived from the ſame original language. But language, paſſing through ſo many mouths, not only of the ſame nation, but of ſo many different nations, and travelling all over the globe, is the moſt changeable of all the arts, I may ſay of all the things belonging to men. Alphabetical characters, which certainly came from Egypt where they were invented, one ſhould think much more fixed and permanent than the ſound or ſenſe of language. Yet, though there were but two kinds of them in Egypt, the one, which they called their ſacred characters, the other, their popular, when they went to other countries, they multiplied to 74 different alphabets, of which ſpecimens are given us in a book publiſhed in Rome upon the writing art, written by a countryman of mine, of the name of Elphingſton, as I remember. Now, I doubt whether any one of theſe alphabets had the exact figures of either of the Egyptian alphabets: And we are to conſider, that the writing art travelled to very few countries, compared to the number of thoſe to whom the language of Egypt was propagated; for it is only a few nations of learning, that have the uſe of written characters.

And thus, I think, I have proved, both by fact and argument, that Egypt was the parent country of all arts and ſciences, even of that parent art, without which there could have been no other art, nor even civil ſociety itſelf.

It

It may be thought that it is derogatory from the providence and goodneſs of God, to ſuppoſe that he ſhould have confined the invention of arts and ſciences, which are of abſolute neceſſity, for reſtoring man from his fallen ſtate, to one country only. But I anſwer this objection, in the ſame manner as Ariſtotle has anſwered many others of the ſame kind;—That providence, as it leaves nothing undone that is neceſſary or proper, ſo it does nothing that is unneceſſary or ſuperfluous. That the country of Egypt was ſufficient for the invention of arts, and propagating them all over the earth, the event has ſhown. But, beſides, as the univerſe is a ſyſtem, and the moſt perfect of all ſyſtems, and as in every ſyſtem there muſt be variety as well as order and uniformity, it was impoſſible, that every country ſhould be as well fitted by its ſituation, its climate and ſoil, and the genius of its inhabitants, for the invention and propagation of civility and arts, as Egypt. It was, therefore, perfectly agreeable to the wiſdom and goodneſs of the great author of nature, that this country ſhould be ſelected for that purpoſe, and that a race of Kings ſhould be given them of intelligence ſuperior to men, (without which, all the advantages of nature I have mentioned, would not, in my opinion, have availed), ſuch a race as is not, nor ever was to be found, in any other nation.

That all nations ſhould have made the ſame progreſs in arts and ſciences that the Egyptians did, would have been inconſiſtent with the difference we find among men as well as among other animals, and with the variety of ſituations and circumſtances, which muſt neceſſarily be. It may be objected, that ſome people have not yet got the uſe of ſpeech, ſuch as the Orang Outangs; ſo that they can neither invent nor learn any art or ſcience, nor even live in civil ſociety. But my anſwer is, that, though the Orang Outang has not hitherto learned to ſpeak, he may ſtill learn it in ſome future time. The ſavage people in Æthiopia, who, in the

time of Diodorus Siculus, had not learned to ſpeak *, have ſince learned it; for there are now no people in Æthiopia who have not the uſe of ſpeech: And, in the ſame manner, if by one of thoſe many revolutions, which happen in the affairs of men, a people of arts ſhould ſettle in that part of Africa where the Orang Outangs live, and mix with them, I think there can be no doubt that they would acquire the faculty of ſpeech, though, I am perſuaded, very ſlowly, as Peter the wild Boy did.

CHAP.

* See p. 123. of this vol.

CHAP. VI.

The hiſtory of Religion fitly ſubjoined to the hiſtory of arts and ſciences.—In what ſenſe Religion is natural to man:—It does not belong to him in his natural ſtate, nor even when he lives in herds,—but only in the civilized ſtate;—not even in the firſt ages of civility.—This proved both by the reaſon of the thing, and by three examples.—The knowledge of a God aroſe from man's ſtudying himſelf.—The progreſs of that ſtudy, and the reaſoning, by which men were convinced of the exiſtence of ſuch a Being.—As men formed the firſt idea of a God from themſelves, they naturally made him like themſelves, conſiſting both of body and mind, but both more excellent than theirs.—Egypt the country in which Religion had its origin, as well as arts and ſciences.—This proved both by the reaſon of the thing, and the authorities of authors.—Egypt having been governed ſo long by Dæmon Kings, there were two Religions there, a Philoſophical Religion, and a Religion for the vulgar.—Religion went from Egypt to Greece;—alſo to India, where ſeveral monuments of the Religion of Egypt are to be ſeen at this day.—The idea of a God went to other countries as well as to Greece and India, though not the worſhip as practiſed in Egypt.—A plurality of Gods according to the firſt Religion among men;—but one principal among them, according to the Religion both of Egypt and Greece.—As thoſe antient Gods were ſuppoſed to have bodies, they had alſo ſenſes that were to be gratified;—and their minds alſo were to be gained, in the ſame way as the minds of men, by things preſented to them.—The firſt things offered to the Gods were the fruits of the earth.—The memory of theſe offerings preſerved both in Egypt and

Greece.—When men began to eat fleſh, animals were offered to the Gods.—This done ſo conſtantly when they killed animals, that to kill *was ſaid to* ſacrifice.—*This enjoined in ſome nations as a duty,—particularly among the Jews.—The Gods, by thoſe ſacrifices, were ſuppoſed to have their ſmell gratified, and their ears pleaſed by the muſic accompanying the ſacrifice.—Their eyes alſo pleaſed by magnificent Temples, Altars, and Proceſſions.—In return for theſe offerings, it was expected that the Gods would give them ſucceſs in war and their other occupations;—and would reveal to them future events, which they ſuppoſed was done in many different ways.—Among the Jews, Moſes was obliged to eſtabliſh a Religion reſembling the Religion of the times:—They were incapable of receiving any other.—This the ſtate of Religion in the firſt ages of the world, before arts and ſciences had made any conſiderable progreſs.—But after arts and ſciences were improved, Religion wore a very different face.—All arts, ſciences, and Philoſophy, came originally from Egypt.—From Egypt they went to Greece.—Of the great diſcoveries made by Philoſophy in Theology.—Of the Platonic Doctrine of the Trinity.—The firſt, ſecond, and third perſons of that Trinity explained.—An error ſhown in our Engliſh tranſlation, with reſpect to the ſecond perſon of the Trinity.—Of Plato's doctrine with reſpect to a ſtate of pre-exiſtence, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments.—The Religion of the Philoſophers of Egypt brought to Greece, and from Greece to Italy,—where it was much cultivated among the Romans.—The popular Religion of Egypt alſo came to Greece and Italy.—The opinions of the Philoſophers muſt have had an influence even upon the opinions of the world.—Of the ſtate of Religion at the time when our Saviour came to the Earth.—The underſtanding of man ſo much then improved, that they had formed the idea of Beings ſuperior to themſelves —But their ideas of ſuch Beings very groſs —By the advances made in Sciences and in Philoſophy, men were diſpoſed to receive a purer Religion when our Saviour*

viour came to the world.—The days of ignorance were then over, as St Paul has ſaid in his ſpeech to the Athenians.—An account given of that ſpeech.—It contains the ſyſtem of pure Theiſm, and gives a deſcription of the true God.—Of this God even the vulgar, among the Athenians, appear at that time to have had ſome idea.—St Paul ſays nothing of the particular doctrines of Chriſtianity, except in one verſe, where he ſpeaks of the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt.—This laughed at by the Athenians,—though probably the Egyptians believed in the reſurrection of the body.—St Paul would explain to his Converts the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity, as 1ſt, *The doctrine of the Trinity, of which an explanation is already given in this chapter.—*2do, *The doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God,—of which an explanation is here given.* 3tio, *The incarnation, which is likewiſe here explained.—Another important doctrine of Chriſtianity is, that we muſt not believe that we can be happy in this life, but muſt look forward to the next.—This inculcated by our Saviour.—He has alſo provided for our happineſs in this life, if we will obey the laſt precept he gave his Diſciples, to love one another.—The Chriſtian Religion, more a Religion of Love than any other;—yet by the abuſe of it, has produced more diſſentions among men, and more crimes than any other Religion.—Of the end of this World, and the reſtoration of things.—This a doctrine of Antient Philoſophy, with which the revelation by Jeſus Chriſt agrees.—According to it, that new World is not at a very great diſtance.—This to be proved in the ſequel of this work, by ſhowing that not only the minds and bodies of men are degenerated, but their numbers decreaſed.—Thus is proved that our Saviour came to the world in the fulneſs of time, when it was proper he ſhould come.—If he had come ſooner, and in the days of ignorance, his doctrine could not have been received.—This proved by the example of barbarous nations, who cannot be converted to the Chriſtian Religion;—and of the Jews themſelves.—The ſingular circum-*

ſtance

ſtance of the Jews, that they are a nation without a country:—They are in all nations, and of no nation.—The worſt thing in the Heathen Religion was their ſacrifices.—Theſe muſt have been offenſive to the true God:—But that they ſhould be practiſed, was neceſſary among people who had not an underſtanding ſo cultivated, as to make them capable of underſtanding true Religion.—It was indulged even to the Jews.—The reaſon for this indulgence.—But after the coming of our Saviour, Sacrifices, Rites, and Ceremonies, were laid aſide, and a pure Religion eſtabliſhed,—but not all Rites were laid aſide, and particularly not Muſic.—Of the effects of Muſic in exciting Devotion.—It ought to be more practiſed by the Miſſionaries among the barbarous nations.—Of the preſent ſtate of Religion on this earth.—Chriſtianity the Religion of Europe,—alſo of Egypt, in the country about Alexandria.—There both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Sabbaths are obſerved.—In the Weſtern part of Aſia, Mahomediſm prevails;—in the Eaſtern, the popular Religion of Egypt which went to India.—The Philoſophical Religion alſo went there, as the Bramins believe in the Trinity.—Concluſion of the Hiſtory of Religion, Government, Arts, and Sciences.—Theſe three comprehend the Hiſtory of Man, as from them proceed all the operations of the intellect of man.—What is commonly called Hiſtory, is not what the Author calls a Hiſtory of Man;—nor is it a matter of ſcience.

IN the preceding chapters I have given the hiſtory of the origin and progreſs of arts and ſciences. To this, I think, it will not be improper to ſubjoin the hiſtory of religion; a thing of the greateſt importance to man, and which, I think, I have ſhown, and will farther ſhow, is very much connected with arts and ſciences. And as religion is of the utmoſt importance to man, the hiſtory of it, I think, is a material part of the hiſtory of man.

Thoſe

Thoſe, who think that religion is natural to man, are in the right, if they mean that by nature he is religious, when he has gone through that progreſs by which he becomes truly a man, that is, an animal of intellect and ſcience. But if they mean that he is religious in his natural ſtate, they either do not know what that ſtate is, or what religion is: For, in his natural ſtate, he is a mere animal, diſtinguiſhed only from other animals by his having the capacity of intellect and ſcience. Now, in that ſtate, it is impoſſible he can form any idea at all, much leſs an idea ſo noble and exalted as that of God. It is for this reaſon that *Peter the Wild Boy*, as I have elſewhere obſerved*, had no idea of a God. And not only ſolitary ſavages, ſuch as he was, have not that idea; but, after they are aſſociated and come to live in herds, as the Orang-Outang does, they are not able to form that idea. Civil ſociety, therefore, is abſolutely neceſſary for introducing religion among men: And I have further ſhown †, that, even in the firſt ages of that ſociety, men do not form the idea of a God; for what ideas they then form, are only of corporeal ſubſtances, and their operations upon them or upon one another, their only care and attention being concerning the neceſſities and conveniencies of life. This, I think, I have proved, in the paſſage referred to, not only by the reaſon of the thing, but by facts. And I have mentioned two examples, the people of the Pelew Iſlands, and thoſe of New Zealand, who, though they have the uſe of language, and have made ſome progreſs in the neceſſary arts of life, yet have no religion. And to theſe two examples may be added a third, the inhabitants of Botany Bay, as I was informed by a gentleman of the name of Walker, who was four years in that country purſer of a man of war; and a fourth example

* Vol. 3. p. 371.

† Chap. VI. of Book II. of this vol. p. 153.

ample in the people of the Ladrone Iſlands *. And, in general, wherever we find any nation little advanced in the arts of civility and Government, but who have got the idea of a God, we may conclude, that from ſome other nation more civilized, with whom they have had a connection, they have got that idea. This I have ſhown was the caſe of the inhabitants of North America †: And, I am perſuaded, the ſame was the caſe of the inhabitants of Guiana; who, according to Dr Bancroft's account of them ‡, have got the idea of a Supreme God, (ſuch a God as the Indians of North America call *the Great Spirit*,) but which they muſt have got from European nations, particularly the Dutch, with whom they have had an intercourſe for more than a century paſt.

Thus it appears, that, while man was converſant only with external things, he could not form the idea of a God. It was, therefore, neceſſary, before he could do this, that he ſhould practiſe the precept of the Delphic God, and beſides the knowledge of external things, ſhould ſtudy and know himſelf; for, as I have obſerved in more than one place, it is only by knowing ourſelves, that we can have any knowledge of ſuperior intelligencies. By this ſtudy, he would diſcover that there was ſomething within him, which we call *mind*, whereby he moved his body, and, by the intervention of it, other bodies, and by which he conducted his life, and provided what was neceſſary for his ſubſiſtence and defence. But this is not all; for it was further neceſſary that he ſhould look round him, and conſider the works of nature, both in the heavens and earth; where he would perceive that there were motions going on, ſuch as he could not perform, and with very much greater order and regularity than his motions. And here there would be an exerciſe, not only of the intellectual, but of the reaſoning

* See, upon the ſubject of thoſe Iſlands, Churchill's Coll. of Voy. vol. 4. p. 459.

† Page 153 of this vol.

‡ See his Eſſay on the Natural Hiſtory of Guiana, p. 308.

reaſoning faculty; for he would conclude, from comparing the motions of nature with his own, that there muſt be a principle, which performed and directed thoſe motions, infinitely ſuperior, both in wiſdom and power, to that principle within him, which produced and directed his motions.

But, as from the ſtudy of himſelf man formed the idea of a God, it was natural, and indeed neceſſary, that he ſhould ſuppoſe the God, of whom he had formed an idea in the manner I have deſcribed, to be a being ſuch as himſelf, compounded of body and mind, though very much ſuperior to him in both; for he was not yet ſo far advanced in the exerciſe of intellect, as to have formed an idea of a pure intellectual ſubſtance. And, accordingly, we find, that all the Gods of the Greeks, as they are deſcribed by Homer, had bodies as well as minds; but theſe very much ſuperior to thoſe of men *: And in general all the Heathen Gods were ſuppoſed to be beings of that kind, and were ſo repreſented in their ſtatues. But thoſe Gods of the antients were truly no more Gods than the men whom they were pleaſed to deify; for a God muſt be a pure immaterial ſubſtance, entirely ſeparated from matter or body. Now, to conceive diſtinctly ſuch a ſubſtance, requires a great effort of the human intellect. Every idea, as I have elſewhere obſerved †, muſt at firſt be formed by abſtraction: And as all our ideas are firſt formed from the objects of ſenſe, which are the ſource of all our knowledge in this ſtate of our exiſtence, it is neceſſary that we ſhould form the idea of an immaterial ſubſtance, by abſtracting from body all its qualities of ſhape and figure, of ſolidity and reſiſtance, and even of parts. Of this kind of abſtraction, Euclid has given us an example in the definitions, which he has prefixed to his Elements, where he

 ſeparates

* It is a very good deſcription which Homer gives of the Greek Gods in the following line.

Των περ και μειζων 'αξιτη, τιμη τε, βιη τε.

† Page 17. of this volume.

ſeparates a Surface from a Solid, Length from Breadth, and both from what he calls a *point*, which he ſays is without parts. But a Point has poſition, and occupies ſpace; whereas an immaterial ſubſtance occupies no ſpace: So that we muſt make one abſtraction more than Euclid has made. And at the ſame time that we conceive it ſo different from body, we muſt alſo conceive it to be of much greater excellence, not only operating in a way quite different from body, but doing things which it is impoſſible that body can do.

That men muſt have been far advanced in arts and ſciences before they could have made ſuch abſtractions, and formed an idea of a ſubſtance ſo remote from body, and of ſuch ſuperior excellence, is evident. Even the Greeks, when they were ſo far advanced not only in arts and civility, but in ſcience and philoſophy, as to have formed a ſchool of philoſophy, called the *Ionick* ſchool, of which Thales was the founder, had not, in that ſchool, got the idea of ſuch an immaterial ſubſtance as I have deſcribed, who formed and governed this univerſe: For the firſt philoſophers in Greece, were all materialiſts, as Ariſtotle informs us, till Anaxagoras aroſe among them, who firſt employed mind and intelligence to ſet every thing in order, and therefore, ſays Ariſtotle, talked like a ſober man among babbling drunkards *. He was a ſucceſſor of Thales; but at that time the ſchool was above 100 years old. He, however, ſtill retained ſo much of the prejudices of the more antient philoſophy, that after things were once arranged and diſpoſed, he ſuppoſed that they went on by matter and mechaniſm, and accounted, as Plato informs us †, for all the phaenomena of nature, from vapours, æthers, and ſubtile fluids.

In this reſpect he very much reſembled ſome of our modern philoſophers, particularly Sir Iſaac Newton, who accounts in that way for

* See preface to Vol. III. of this work, p. 13.

† See Vol. I. of this work, p. 276.

for all the motions in the univerſe, even the motions of his own body; nor, indeed, does he appear to have had any idea of motion by mind. But, as he acknowledged the exiſtence of a ſupreme intelligence, governing this univerſe, he cannot be ſaid to be an Athieſt, any more than Anaxagoras; but, I think, he was as much a materialiſt.

That Sir Iſaac had not, as I have ſaid, ſo much as the idea of mind moving body, is evident from the different cauſes which he has aſſigned for attraction or gravitation, *which*, he ſays, *proceeds from the action of bodies tending towards one another, or from ſpirits emitted from thoſe bodies agitating one another, or from the action of æthers, air, or ſome medium corporeal or incorporeal, impelling the bodies ſwimming in it towards one another* *. Now, I think, it is impoſſible to believe, that a man who had any conception of mind moving body, ſhould have aſſigned ſo many ſtrange cauſes for that motion, ſome of them, I think, not intelligible. But as he did not believe that his own body was moved by mind, of which we have as ſtrong a proof as we can have of any thing, I mean *conſciouſneſs*, it was no wonder he did not believe that any other body was ſo moved.

Further, he ſays, that not only our animal motions, but our ſenſations, are produced by material cauſes, ſuch as æthers and ſubtile fluids. And, I think, there was nothing, that, upon his principles, ſhould have hindred him from maintaining that our ideas, as well as our ſenſations, were produced by material cauſes, according to an antient philoſopher of the name of Strato †. And here I muſt obſerve, that Sir Iſaac has, in one particular, carried his materialiſm farther than Thales, the founder of the Ionic ſchool: For Thales admitted that the mag-

* Vol. II. of this work, p. 324.

† Vol. III. of ibid. p. 322.

net and the iron were moved towards one another by mind; whereas, according to the principles of Sir Iſaac's philoſophy, I think, it is evident, that he believed no body to be moved in that way: So that it is æthers and ſubtile fluids, which, according to his philoſophy, move magnetic, electrical, and chemical bodies; and move them every way, not only towards one another, but from one another; and give them that very extraordinary motion, which is perceived in ſome chemical bodies, and has ſo much of the operation of mind in it, that it is called *elective attraction*; as by it the body, quiting one body with which it had joined itſelf, attaches itſelf to another.

I have ſaid a great deal of the philoſophy of Sir Iſaac Newton in the three firſt volumes of this work, to which I refer the reader, if he would deſire to know more concerning it; and he may alſo read ſome queries, upon the ſubject, which I have put in volume V. of the Origin and Progreſs of Language *. But, I think, I have ſaid enough here to convince him, that Sir Iſaac did not clearly underſtand the nature of an immaterial ſubſtance, and particularly of that immaterial ſubſtance which is the author, originally or immediately, of all the motions in this univerſe.

As I have ſhown in what country arts and ſciences had their origin, I think it is proper, that I ſhould alſo give an account where religion began. And it is my opinion, that it began in the ſame country where arts and ſciences had their origin; with which, religion, as I have ſhown, is neceſſarily connected. This country is Egypt; and if the reader be convinced, by what I have ſaid, that man is not capable of religion, till he has formed civil ſociety, and has made ſome progreſs in the uſe of intellect, more than is neceſſary for the invention and practice of the neceſſary arts of life; and if,

* Page 419—422.

if, at the ſame time, I have convinced him, that Egypt was the firſt country in which a regular polity was formed, and arts and ſciences invented and cultivated, he can have no doubt that it was alſo the firſt country of religion. This Herodotus has told us, who has ſaid, that the Egyptians were the firſt who gave names to the Gods, and erected temples, altars, and ſtatues, to them *: And Lucian, in his treatiſe *De Dea Syriac*, has told us, that the Egyptians were the firſt of men who had any idea of Gods, built temples to them, and inſtituted Panegyries, and other ſolemn aſſemblies in their honour.

There were in Egypt, as I have elſewhere obſerved †, two religions; the one, a philoſophical religion, which was the religion of the Prieſts, and which they muſt have learned from their Dæmon Kings; the other the vulgar religion of the country, the objects of which were thoſe Dæmons themſelves, whom the Prieſts ſet up as the Gods that the people were to worſhip.

That this popular religion of Egypt went to the Greeks, who got even the names of the Gods from them, is a fact that cannot be diſputed. But it was only the names that went to Greece, for the perſons of the Egyptian Gods, that is of their Dæmon Kings, never went to Greece. But the Greek Gods were Greeks, to whom they gave the names, and aſcribed the adventures, of the Egyptian Gods. It is alſo, I think, certain, that the religion of Egypt went to India, along with their polity and their other inſtitutions. And Sir William Jones has diſcovered, that it travelled in the Eaſt as far as China and Japan, where, he ſays, there are ſtatues to be ſeen, at this day, of Iſis the Egyptian goddeſs, who is ſtill known, even in thoſe countries, by that name. And beſides thoſe ſtatues of Iſis, there are buſts of

* Euterpe, Cap. 4.

† Page 165. of this volume.

of black woolly haired men, which are to be ſeen in the countries that I have mentioned, which muſt, I think, be memorials of Egyptians, who taught them religion, as well as arts and ſciences*. And though religion, as practiſed in Egypt, may not have gone to any other country, except thoſe that I have mentioned, yet I am perſuaded, that the idea of Gods, and ſuperior powers, was propagated to other countries in the ſame manner as their language was: For, though language did not go to other countries as it was ſpoken in Egypt, yet thoſe other countries got from Egypt the idea of forming articulate ſounds, and ſo made a language of their own, with a mixture, no doubt, of ſome words which they may have heard ſpoken by the Egyptians, or by people who had learned to ſpeak from the Egyptians; and, in the ſame manner, other nations may have formed a religion different from the Egyptian, though in imitation of it.

One general obſervation to be made, upon the religion of thoſe very antient times, is, that it always ſuppoſes a plurality of Gods; for, when religion was firſt eſtabliſhed among men, they were not ſo far advanced in the uſe and exerciſe of intellect, as to have the idea of one ſupreme God, who governed this univerſe, and of whom all thoſe other beings, whom they called Gods, were only the miniſters.

As men formed their firſt ideas of Gods from the ſtudy and knowledge of themſelves, they would, as was natural, make them after their own image. And, accordingly, they gave them, as I have ſaid, not only minds, but bodies, and conſequently organs of ſenſe, by which they ſaw and heard, and had other perceptions of ſenſe. And they muſt have ſuppoſed, too, that their minds were ſuch as their own, in this reſpect, that their favours were to be gained by all the marks

* See this enlarged upon in p. 307 of this volume.

marks of honour and reſpect they could ſhow them, and particularly by offerings. Theſe, at firſt, were the fruits of the earth, and particularly the firſt fruits of every year. Of this, the memory was preſerved in Egypt in later times, when they preſented to the goddeſs, Iſis, handfulls of the firſt fruits of the corn of every year. And, in Greece, the memory of thoſe bloodleſs offerings was preſerved in the iſland of Delos, where, in later times, there was ſtill to be ſeen an altar that never had been ſtained with blood, upon which, they offered nothing to the Gods except the fruits of the earth. But, when men began to eat fleſh, and eſteemed it the moſt valuable part of diet, it was natural that they ſhould preſent to their Gods ſacrifices of animals. And this was thought ſo much a religious duty, that, of every animal, which they killed for eating, ſome part was offered to the Gods, and this part they offered before they began to eat of the animal: So that it was a kind of *primitiae*, which they threw into the fire and burnt as an offering to the Gods, calling it θυελλον. And hence it is, that in the language of Homer, to kill a beaſt for eating, is ſaid to be ἱερευειν, that is *to ſacrifice* it. And by the law of Moſes it was enjoined, that every man, that killed an ox, a lamb, or a goat, ſhould bring it to the door of the tabernacle, to offer it as an offering to the Lord; and this is enjoined under the pain of death *. And they not only courted their favour, by ſacrificing ſingle animals at different times, but by hecatombs of them at one time, upon ſome particular occaſions. And, as the more precious the animal was, they thought the ſacrifice to the Gods would be the more acceptable, they carried the matter ſo far, in ſome nations, that they ſacrificed even animals of their own ſpecies, and ſometimes their own children, which, as they were the deareſt to them of all things, they thought would be the moſt acceptable to the Gods. And as theſe Gods had the ſenſe of ſmell, as well as other ſenſes, they imagined that they would be pleaſed with

* *Leviticus*, chap. 17. v. 3. &c.

with the ſmell of their burnt offerings *, which aſcended to the ſkies, where they ſuppoſed they reſided. And, as their ſacrifices were accompanied with muſic, they thought that the ears of their Gods were entertained in that way, as their ſight was by magnificent temples, altars, pomps, and proceſſions, and by numberleſs rites and ceremonies which accompanied the antient worſhip. And the legiſlators, and magiſtrates, in ſome countries, particularly in Egypt, very much encouraged a worſhip of ſo much pomp and ſhow, and accompanied by ſo many rites and ceremonies, becauſe they thought it was the only way to preſerve religion among the people, who muſt be attached to it by their ſenſes, and not by their reaſon.

In return for theſe oblations, and their devotion to their Gods, they expected ſucceſs in their wars, and in all the occupations in which they were employed; and, as the ſucceſs of theſe depended very much upon their knowledge of future events, they expected that their Gods were to inform them of theſe by prophecies, dreams, oracles, auſpices, or the entrails of beaſts, and by augury, that is, the flight of birds. And in this way a kind of intercourſe and commerce was carried on betwixt thoſe antient men and their Gods.

As the Jews were a people as much or more governed by their ſenſes than any other nation, it was neceſſary that Moſes ſhould eſtabliſh among them a religion, of as much pomp and ſplendor, and of as many rites and ceremonies, as any of the Heathen religions. And there was another reaſon alſo, that the people, who had been ſo long in Egypt, and ſo much accuſtomed to a religion of that kind, could never have been made converts to a religion ſo ſimple as that of their anceſtors the Patriarchs; but if Moſes had attempted to give them ſuch a religion, they would have revolted, and become idolaters, like the Egyptians and the other neighbouring nations. Moſes,

* *Leviticus*, chap. 17. v. 6.

Moſes, therefore, was obliged to allow them temples, altars, ſacrifices, and all the pomp and ſhow, rites and ceremonies, that were practiſed in Egypt and in other countries. And our Scripture tells us, that, on account of the hardneſs of their hearts, and their violent propenſity to the idolatry of other nations, God gave them laws, which were not good, but to which it was neceſſary to ſubject them *. This reaſon for the Moſaical religious inſtitutions is very well enforced by Spencer, in his moſt learned work, *De Legibus Hebraeorum;* where he has ſhown, I think, very evidently, that a more ſimple religion never could have been adopted by a people ſo groſsly ſenſual as the Jews.

It is this character of the Jewiſh nation, their attachment to the pleaſures of the body and the things of this world, without appearing to have the leaſt idea of a life to come, which, I am perſuaded, was the reaſon why that *life and immortality*, which was afterwards revealed by our Saviour to them and to all mankind, was no part of the Moſaical religion. If he had preached to them that they were to live after their death, they not only would not have believed him, but it would have diſcredited all the reſt of his doctrine, as much as the aboliſhing the ſacrifices, and the whole ritual of the Egyptians and other Heathen nations, would have done. Moſes, therefore, accommodated himſelf in this, as well as in other parts of his legiſlation, to the genius of the people, with whom he had to deal, to *the hardneſs of their hearts*, and, I think I may add, to the dulneſs of their underſtandings †. I think, therefore, Biſhop War-

* ‘ Becauſe they had not executed my judgments, but had deſpiſed my ſtatutes, and ‘ had polluted my Sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers idols; Wherefore ‘ I gave them alſo ſtatutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they ſhould not ‘ live’. Ezekiel, chap. 20. v. 24.

† Joſephus, *contra Apionem*, (lib. 2.), tells us that one Apollonius ſaid of them, that they were αφυιστατοι των βαρβαρων, *the dulleſt of all Barbarians;* and that they alone had

burton needed not have given himſelf ſo much trouble to account for that ſingularity of the legiſlation of Moſes, that he did not inforce the religion he taught the Jews, by rewards and puniſhments in a future life, as was done by other legiſlators of antient nations, which had cultivated their underſtandings more, and had made greater progreſs in arts and ſciences.

While men were yet in the natural ſtate, or but little advanced in civil life, and conſequently had made little or no progreſs in the cultivation of arts and ſciences, by which the human intellect is improved, and made fit to form the idea of the Supreme Being, the ſtate of religion could not, I think, have been other than ſuch as I have deſcribed *. But after arts were further improved, ſciences invented, and carried up to philoſophy, and even to the ſummit of philoſophy, I mean theology, religion began to wear a new face.

That

had never invented any thing uſeful for human life. And even the Fathers of the Chriſtian church give the ſame account of them; particularly St Baſil, in the firſt of his *Hexamera*, ſays, That it was probable that there was ſomething exiſting before the Moſaical world, but Moſes did not relate it, becauſe it would not have been intelligible τοις εισαγομενοις ετι, και νηπιοις κατα την γνωσιν; that is, to his own countrymen, who were to be conſidered as *infants yet in underſtanding, and only beginning to learn*. And to the ſame purpoſe, St Chryſoſtom, in his ſecond Diſcourſe upon *Geneſis*, ſays, That Moſes, in giving an account of the beginning of things to the Jews, who were unable to comprehend any thing of a ſpiritual or intellectual nature, addreſſed himſelf to their ſenſes; at which, ſays he, we ought not to be ſurpriſed, as he was ſpeaking τοις παχυτατοις Ιουδαιοις, *to the Jews, the dulleſt of men*. See upon this ſubject Burnet's *Archaeologia*, p. 469. and 470. See further, upon the ſubject of the Jews, what Lactantius, a Chriſtian author who lived under Conſtantine the Emperor, in his *Inſtitutes*, (Lib. 4. Cap. 2.) ſays of them; That Pythagoras, and after him Plato and others, went every where in ſearch of knowledge, to Egypt particularly, but not to the Jews. This ſhows the miſtake of thoſe authors who have advanced that Plato learned the doctrine of the Trinity from the Jews; and, indeed, if Plato had gone among them to learn philoſophy, they could not have revealed to him that myſtery, which was no part of the doctrine, that Moſes taught the Jews.

* Page 378. and 374.

That all arts, ſciences, and philoſophy, came originally from Egypt, I have proved to the ſatisfaction, I hope, of my readers. They were all very much cultivated there, and particularly philoſophy, which, as it contains the principles of all ſciences, may be fitly called the *ſcience of ſciences*. And as they were ſo religious a people, it would have been very extraordinary if they had not applied their philoſophy to religion: But this they did; and accordingly they had a philoſophical religion as well as a popular *. Of their popular religion I have already ſpoken, and ſhown, that it went to Greece, and to other countries. But as to their philoſophical religion, it was only the religion of the philoſophers in Egypt, and was kept as a myſtery from the reſt of the people. It went, however, to Greece, but ſtill in the ſhape of a myſtery; for it was communicated to ſome few of the learned Greeks who came to Egypt, and they communicated it to a very few choſen men of their country, under the ſeal of inviolable ſecrecy; and the doctrines of this religion made what they called the *myſteries*, greater and leſſer. Of theſe myſteries Biſhop Warburton has given us a very full and accurate account, (for which, I think, the learned world is much obliged to him), in his firſt volume of the Divine Legation of Moſes. They came to Greece from Egypt, as Dr Warburton tells us; and, indeed, they could come from no other country: And they maintained, firſt, the doctrine of one God; then, an antecedent ſtate of man, in which he was much happier than in his preſent ſtate, and which, I find, is alſo mentioned by Jamblichus, the Alexandrian philoſopher, in his work *De Myſteriis* †; and likewiſe a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments: And to thoſe who were initiated into the greater myſteries, who were very few, it was revealed, that the Gods of the popular religion were mere mortal men.

* Page 165. and 373. of this vol.

† Page 176.

This was the moſt perfect ſyſtem, of natural religion, that ever was among men, containing, as we have ſeen, the fundamental doctrines of our revealed religion; nor do I think, that human reaſon, even cultivated as it was among the Egyptians by arts and ſciences, could have gone farther.

To thoſe, who were initiated into the greater myſteries, (which was not till four years after their initiation into the leſſer; for theſe were conſidered as only a preparation for the greater*), was revealed that great myſtery of the Unity of God; and that all the Gods of the Greeks and Romans were mere mortal men;—a truth, which the Egyptians did only reveal to thoſe who were to govern the ſtate, and not even to all the Prieſts, but only to thoſe who were moſt approved of for their education and learning†. Thoſe who were admitted to the greater myſteries, were accounted the happieſt of men; and were ſaid to be born again, and to begin a new life, being reclaimed from an irrational and ſavage life, and *cultivated and mitigated into humanity*, as Cicero expreſſes it; from whence, he ſays, theſe myſteries were called *initia*, being *re vera principia vitae, the beginning of a truly rational life;* and making us live not only pleaſantly in this life, but giving us the hopes of a better life hereafter ‡. Iſocrates, in his *Panegyric*, ſays, that the myſteries are the thing which human nature principally ſtands in need of §. And Plato has ſaid, that the deſign of Initiation was to reſtore the ſoul to that ſtate from whence it fell, as from its native ſtate of perfection ‖. And Proclus, the Alexandrian philoſopher, tells us, that the myſteries and initiations drew the

* See Warburton's *Divine Legation*, Vol. I. p. 182.

† Ibid. p. 190.

‡ Cicero, *De Legibus*, Lib. 2. Cap. 14.—Warburton, *ubi ſupra*, p. 210.

§ Warburton, *ubi ſupra*, p. 213. where he has given us other paſſages from antient authors, ſhowing the happineſs which the initiated enjoy.

‖ Plato, *in Phaedone*; and Warburton, p. 172.

the ſouls of men from a material, ſenſual, and merely human life, and joined them in communion with God. And not only did the initiated enjoy intellectual pleaſures, greater than other men, but even the pleaſures of body, which nature beſtows on us, ſuch as the *light* of the ſun*.

And here it may not be improper to obſerve, that the Egyptians not only invented thoſe arts, without which men could not have lived in civil ſociety, but alſo, that we owe to them ſciences and philoſophy, in which they appear to have excelled all the nations that ever exiſted;—Further, that they applied their philoſophy to the moſt uſeful purpoſe in human life, the framing a good form of polity, the beſt that ever exiſted. And, laſtly, when to arts, ſciences, and philoſophy, they added ſuch a religion, by which they provided for the happineſs of men in the life to come, as much as they could do by the light of natural reaſon, muſt we not allow that the wiſdom of the Egyptians deſerves all the praiſe which our Scripture and the antient Greek writers beſtow on it†, and that they were truly a wonderful people, worthy of being choſen by providence to be the inventors, the depoſitaries, and the propagators, of arts and ſciences all over the world.

This philoſophical religion of Egypt was not only communicated to certain philoſophers of Greece, but it was, by ſome of thoſe philoſophers, committed to writing, particularly by Plato, who has given us the ſame pure ſyſtem of Theiſm, revealed to the initiated in the myſteries, alſo the pre-exiſtent and more perfect ſtate of man, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. There was, however, one of the doctrines of the myſteries, that he has thought proper not to publiſh, for a reaſon which may be eaſily gueſſed;—That all the deities worſhipped by the people were mere men.

There

* Ibid. p. 175. † Page 135.

There was one myſtery, however, known to the Egyptians, though not communicated to the Greeks in their initiations, but which Plato learned in Egypt, though he did not publiſh it in his writings, keeping it as a myſtery which he revealed to a very few of his followers. The doctrine, I mean, is, that of the Trinity. But, though kept as a ſecret by Plato while he lived, it has been publiſhed ſince his death, and is to be found in ſome of the writings of the philoſophers of the Alexandrian ſchool, who, I believe, had a traditional knowledge of the philoſophy both of Plato and Ariſtotle; and, beſides, we are ſure that they had the uſe of books, upon the ſubject of philoſophy, which are now loſt. The firſt perſon of Plato's Trinity, he calls the πρωτος θεος, and who, he ſays, is ὑπερουσιος, that is, *above*, or *ſuperior, to all being*. And, however extraordinary this appellation may appear, I think it is perfectly juſt; for, as all being has proceeded from him, he muſt be ſuperior to all being, and ſomething different from being, as the cauſe muſt be different from the effect. The ſecond perſon of Plato's Trinity is, the Νους, or, as it is called in the New Teſtament, Λογος, a word which, in claſſical Greek, expreſſes what is different from Νους: For it denotes the operation of the Νους, either internally in thinking or reaſoning, or externally in ſpeech; ſo that it is either the Λογος ενδιαθετος, or Λογος προφορικος. But if the uſe of the word Λογος, in our New Teſtament, be not claſſical, the tranſlation we have given of it, by the term *word*, is ſtill much further removed from the word Νους, which ought to be tranſlated by the Engliſh word *intellect*; whereas we have tranſlated it by the term *word*, that is, an articulate ſound, uttered by the human mouth, ſignificant of any of our ideas. This is a tranſlation moſt abſurd, and which makes the doctrine of the Trinity quite unintelligible. But to return to Plato.—This ſecond perſon of the Trinity he calls the θεος δημιουργος, and this appellation is perfectly agreeable to our Scripture; for it ſays, that by the Son, which is the name it gives to the ſecond perſon of the Trinity, *all things were made, and*

and without him nothing was made. The third perſon of Plato's Trinity is the ψυχη του κοσμου, that is, the animating ſpirit of the Univerſe, called, in our Scripture language, the Πνευμα 'αγιον, and which, in our tranſlation, we call the *Holy Ghoſt*, a ſtrange name for the *Holy Spirit;* by which all things in the Univerſe, formed by intelligence, that is, the ſecond perſon of the Trinity, have life and action, and without which the whole creation would be an inanimate maſs.

That this Platonic doctrine of the Trinity is the ſame with the Chriſtian, I think is evident, and ſuch was the opinion of the fathers of the church *.

Dr Warburton, in his ſecond volume of the Divine Legation, maintains, that the Greek philoſophers did not believe in thoſe religious doctrines I have mentioned, communicated to the initiated in the myſteries, particularly not in a ſtate of future rewards and puniſhments, which they conſidered as a doctrine very uſeful in ſociety, and, therefore, were at pains to inculcate it, though they did not believe it. But, though all the philoſophers of Greece did not believe in a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, particularly the Epicureans, who entirely denied the providence of God, and whoſe Gods they ſaid took no concern in human affairs; and though ſome of the other philoſophers do not appear to have had a firm belief upon that point, yet I cannot be perſuaded, that the initiated in the myſteries did not believe the doctrines they learned in thoſe myſteries; and much leſs can I be perſuaded, that the Egyptian Prieſts, from whom the Greeks got thoſe myſteries, did not themſelves believe in them, but meant to impoſe upon the credulity of the Greeks, for what purpoſe is not eaſy to ſay. The Egyptians,

* See St Cyrillus in his 3d book *againſt the Emperor Julian;* and Euſebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Cap. 14.—20. See alſo what I have further written upon the ſubject of the Trinity, Vol. I. Origin of Language, p. 7. 2d edition.—Vol. V. p. 338. and 344. and Vol. III. of this work, p. 22.

tians, as Herodotus tells us, firſt diſcovered the immortality of the ſoul; and, I think, by the natural light of reaſon, eſpecially a reaſon ſo much cultivated as theirs, by arts and ſciences, the Egyptians, if they applied their philoſophy to religion, which they certainly did, and had a philoſophical as well as a popular religion, muſt have diſcovered, even without the aſſiſtance of their Dæmon Kings, not only the immortality of the ſoul, as Herodotus tells us they did, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, but all the other doctrines, which they communicated to the initiated.

Beſides this doctrine of the Trinity, Plato, as I have obſerved *, maintained a pre-exiſtent ſtate of man, and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments; and conſequently he muſt have believed in the immortality of the ſoul: And the ſame appears to have been the doctrine of Ariſtotle, who has told us, that our intellectual mind is never in ſo perfect a ſtate as when it exiſts by itſelf, diſencumbered of the body.

This religious philoſophy went from Greece to Italy, where it was much cultivated among the Romans; ſo that the religion of the philoſophers of Egypt, that is the Prieſts, was in this way ſpread over a conſiderable part of Europe. But ſtill the popular religion of all the nations of the earth, (the Jews only excepted), continued to be groſs idolatry; for they worſhipped Gods of fleſh and blood, and who had all the paſſions belonging to men, and many of their vices, in which their worſhippers, as was natural, were diſpoſed to imitate them. Then it was a moſt bloody religion, being accompanied with the ſlaughter of ſo many of the animal race, which muſt have been very offenſive to a gracious God, who deſires the preſervation of all that race, as far as is conſiſtent with the general ſyſtem of nature. With ſuch a religion, it was impoſſible that a people could be happy in

* Page 381.

in this, or the next world, whatever the caſe of a few philoſophers, among them, might have been. A better popular religion, therefore, was of abſolute neceſſity for the happineſs of man. Although the popular religion of Egypt, which had come firſt to Greece, and from thence to the other nations of Europe, ſtill continued to be the religion of the people of theſe nations, I am perſuaded, however, that the opinions of the philoſophers muſt have been known to many of them, though they did not apply themſelves particularly to philoſophy, and muſt have had an influence upon their minds, ſo as to diſpoſe them to receive a better religion.

In this ſtate was religion when our Saviour appeared on this earth. While men were in the ſtate of nature, and wandering about ſolitary, and even when they were aſſociated in herds, they could not, as I have ſhown*, have the idea of a God; nor even in the firſt ages of civility could they form any proper idea of the Supreme Being: So that when we find a nation in that ſituation, having any ſuch idea of God, we ſhould conclude that it got the idea from ſome more civiliſed nation, with which it had an intercourſe. Such was the caſe of the nations of North America, and of the people of Guiana in South America †. But when arts and ſciences had made ſome progreſs among men, their underſtanding was thereby ſo much improved, that they formed the idea of beings exiſting ſuperior to themſelves. But their notions of ſuch beings were, as I have ſhown, very groſs, and they made them, as was natural, very like to themſelves ‡. But when they had made farther progreſs in arts and ſciences, and had aſcended to philoſophy, and even to the higheſt part of it, theology, not only the philoſophers would be diſpoſed to embrace a better religion, but even the vulgar, from what they muſt have heard of the opinions of the learned among them, would liſten to

* See p. 367. of this Vol.

† Ibid. p. 368. ‡ Page 384.

the doctrines of that better religion, which would ſhow them, at the ſame time, the abſurdities of the religion they profeſſed.

Thus it appears, that the Chriſtian religion is founded upon principles of philoſophy, ſuch as are formed from the ſtudy of nature; and, indeed, I think it would be abſurd, and even impious, to maintain that there is any thing in it contrary to the eſtabliſhed order of nature and the ſyſtem of the univerſe. But, ſo far from that, it is a moſt philoſophical religion, much more ſo than any other religion that ever was in the world; and it was fit it ſhould be ſo, as philoſophy was ſo far advanced in the world; nor could the philoſophers have believed in it, if it had not been founded on principles of philoſophy. The myſtery of the Trinity is, as I ſhall ſhow in the next volume, not only a very great myſtery of religion, but of philoſophy, as it not only explains to us the nature of the Divinity, but leads to the knowledge of ſuch a ſyſtem in the univerſe, as to a man, who is philoſopher enough to comprehend it, muſt appear aſtoniſhing. And it was neceſſary that this myſtery ſhould be revealed to Chriſtians, as, without having the nature of the Divinity thus explained, they could not comprehend how our Saviour ſhould be the Son of God, nor could they have any idea of the third perſon of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit.

That this myſtery of the Trinity was revealed to the apoſtles, cannot, I think, be doubted, as they were not philoſophers, and therefore could not diſcover it themſelves. But, I believe, the Egyptians did themſelves, with the aſſiſtance of their Dæmon Kings, make this great diſcovery in philoſophy, which aſcends to the very ſummit of theology. This diſcovery they communicated to Plato; and their was another diſcovery of theirs, which they alſo communicated to Plato, I mean the doctrine of *ideas*. This doctrine I have no doubt that Plato brought with him from Egypt, as well

as

as that of the Trinity, with which I ſhall ſhow that it has a neceſſary connection, and that both together make a wonderful chain of beings, reaching from the firſt perſon of the Trinity, the ſource of all being, to the loweſt beings in the Univerſe.

But there was one truth, and a truth of great importance, which was revealed by our Saviour to the world, but was not known to the Egyptian or Greek philoſophers. It was this: They knew there was to be a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, and a new world, or renovation of things, a παλιγγενεσις, as they called it; but when this was to happen, whether ſoon or in ſome very remote period, they knew not. But our Saviour let his diſciples know that it was not far off; and one of the chief purpoſes of his miſſion appears to have been to give this information to the human race, that they might be prepared for the change in their ſtate, which was to happen ſoon, by repenting and turning from their evil ways. That this was part of the revelation of our Saviour, is clearly proved by many texts both in the apoſtles and the epiſtles *.

From the account I have given of the philoſophy of the Chriſtian religion, it is evident that it was a religion fitted for a learned age, ſuch as the age of Auguſtus Cæſar; but could not have been propagated in an unlearned age. Such an age, the apoſtle Paul, in his ſpeech to the Areopagus, calls the *times of ignorance* †. At theſe

* St Math. chap. 16. v. 28.—St Mark, chap. 9. v. 1.—St Luke, chap. 9. v. 27.—Ibid. chap. 21. v. 32.—St John, chap. 21. v. 22.—1ſt Corinth. chap. 15. v. 51.—1ſt Theſſalon. chap. 4. v. 15. From theſe texts it may ſeem wonderful, that this great event has not happened in the ſpace of 1800 years. But this is no reaſon to make us believe that it is never to happen; *For a thouſand years in the ſight of God are as one day.* That this world, or at leaſt the race of man in it, is drawing to an end, is, as I ſhall ſhow in the ſequel of this work, a truth of philoſophy, and to be proved both by reaſon and argument, and by fact and obſervation.

† Acts of the Apoſtles, chap. 17. v. 30.

times, he ſays, that *God winked*, by which, I underſtand, he means, that he allowed men to go on in this groſs idolatry, as they were then capable of no better religion. *But now he commandeth all men every where to repent*, that is, to renounce their idolatrous religion, and to receive a better. And, accordingly, in this ſpeech, St Paul gives the Athenians a ſyſtem of genuine theiſm, telling them, *that there was one God that made the world and all things therein, ſeeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worſhipped with mens hands, as though he needed any thing, ſeeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they ſhould ſeek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain alſo of your own poets have ſaid, For we are alſo his offſpring. Foraſmuch then as we are the offſpring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or ſilver, or ſtone graven by art and mans device.* Of this God it appears, that even the vulgar, and thoſe of the popular religion in Athens, had ſome idea; for St Paul informs us, that they had erected an altar, with this inſcription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD, *who*, St Paul ſays, *was the God that he declared unto them.*

Having laid down in this manner the general principles of Theiſm, he ſays nothing of the particular doctrines of Chriſtianity except in one verſe*, where he ſays, *that God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteouſneſs, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given aſſurance unto all men, in that he hath raiſed him from the dead.* And here St Paul tells us, that when they heard of the reſurrection of the dead, *ſome mocked*, and others

* Acts of the Apoſtles, chap. 17. v. 31.

others ſaid, *we will hear thee again of this matter*. And certainly the reſurrection of the body is not a truth of natural religion, nor of philoſophy; though I think it is highly probable, that the Egyptians believed in it, as I cannot account for the extraordinary care they took to preſerve the bodies of their dead, otherwiſe than by ſuppoſing, that they believed they were to inhabit them again. But, I think, there can be no doubt, that to his converts, particularly Dionyſius the Areopagite, Paul explained and inculcated the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity, ſuch as that of the Trinity, with the knowledge of which, as Paul was no philoſopher, I muſt ſuppoſe that he was inſpired. The *eternal generation of the Son of God*, ſo that the Son is co-eternal with the Father, is another fundamental doctrine of Chriſtianity. It is a neceſſary conſequence of the doctrine of the Trinity, and would be eaſily explained to men who had the leaſt tincture of philoſophy, and could diſtinguiſh the productions of natural and temporary things, from the productions of things divine and eternal: Of *thoſe*, the cauſe producing is always prior to the production; whereas, of *theſe*, the cauſe producing and the production being both eternal, the production muſt be coeval with the cauſe. A third fundamental doctrine of the Chriſtian religion is, *the incarnation of the Son of God*. But this would be ſtill more eaſily explained to a man who knew ſo much of himſelf as to know that he was compounded of three natures, the vegetable, the animal, and the intellectual. To theſe three it is not difficult to conceive, that a fourth might be added,—the divine. The firſt three made Jeſus Chriſt a man, and a man only, but the fourth made him more than man, and the Saviour of the world. And this, I think, is ſufficient to ſhow, that the Chriſtian religion is a learned and philoſophical religion, fit for the age in which it was brought into the world.

Theſe are the doctrines which, I ſuppoſe, St Paul taught his diſciples in

in private, though he did not communicate them to the people of Athens in the Areopagus. But there is one fundamental doctrine of Chriſtianity, and of Theiſm in general, with which he ſets out in his ſpeech to that aſſembly; and that was the Unity of the Godhead: *There was one God*, he ſays, *that made the world and all things therein; ſeeing he is Lord of heaven and earth*, &c. *And this was*, he ſays, *the unknown God, to whom they had erected an altar, and who was the God that he declared unto them.* By this doctrine, *of one God*, St Paul meant to put an end to that Polytheiſm, which was univerſal in all the Heathen nations, and particularly among the Athenians, *who*, as St Paul ſays, *were too ſuperſtitious;* more ſo, I think, than other Heathen nations, as appears from the altar dedicated *To the unknown God;* ſuch as, I believe, was not to be found in any other nation in the world. Of this altar St Paul makes a very good uſe, and lets them know, that the unknown God, to whom they dedicated the altar, was the one God, who had made the heaven and earth, and all things therein. And it was, as I have ſaid, a fundamental doctrine of Chriſtianity, that Jeſus came from this one God, not to eſtabliſh different religions in different countries, but to give one religion to all mankind, by which they were to be ſaved, if they would embrace that religion, and conform themſelves to the precepts of it: So that the miſſion of Jeſus was not, like the miſſion of Moſes, to one people, but to all the people of the earth; and, therefore, the world, in conſequence of this miſſion, as it had but one God, was to have but one religion; and not to be divided into many local and territorial religions, of which there were many different deities even in the ſame country.

I am now to ſhow, that it was not only a learned, philoſophical religion, but a religion for the people, and more fitted to make them virtuous and happy, both in this life and the next, than any religion that ever was among men;---In ſhort, that it was a popular religion of

of the beſt kind poſſible, a religion that was entirely wanting on this earth, as I have obſerved, when our Saviour came to it.

The fundamental principle of this *practical* religion, as it may be called, is the love of God and of man. We are commanded *to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and with all our ſouls, and with all our ſtrengths, and with all our minds, and our neighbour as ourſelves* *. Where the reader may obſerve, from the number of words employed in delivering this precept, how earneſtly it is enforced. And again our Saviour, when he takes leave of his diſciples, ſays, *A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye alſo love one another* †. By this being called *a new commandment*, I underſtand is meant, that it was not commanded by any other religion then in the world: And, accordingly, it is added in the following verſe, *By this ſhall all men know that ye are my diſciples, if ye have love one to another*; which is plainly ſaying, that this love was the diſtinguiſhing mark of their religion. The Chriſtian religion is, therefore, more a religion of love, than any religion that is, or ever was, in the world ‡. Now, love is the nobleſt of all our paſſions; for the object of it is beauty, worth, and goodneſs, in ſhort, every quality that is eſtimable or amiable: And the greateſt happineſs we can enjoy in this life,

* Luke, chap. 10. v. 27.

† St John, chap. 13. v. 34.

‡ See what I have further ſaid of this predominant quality in the Chriſtian religion in Vol. IV. of Origin of Language, p. 367. and following; where ſeveral other texts of the New Teſtament are quoted to prove it; and particularly, 1ſt Corinth. chap. 13. where the word αγαπη, which ſignifies *Love*, is very improperly expreſſed in our tranſlation by the word *Charity*. Now, of the three Chriſtian virtues, *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, or *Love*, as it ſhould be tranſlated, *Love* is the greateſt. (1ſt Corinth. chap. 13. v. 13.) And one text is quoted, p. 370. which ſays, *That perfect love caſteth out fear*. Now, the object of ſuch a love, can be nothing but *beauty*; or *the beauty of holineſs*, as it is called in our Scripture language.

life, is to love and to be loved; and yet the depravity of men, in modern times, is ſuch, that this religion of love has given occaſion to perſecutions, civil wars, murders, and maſſacres, ſuch as no religion, in antient times, ever produced *; which has made our Saviour ſay, *That he came not to bring peace to the earth, but a ſword* †.

There is another fundamental tenet of the Chriſtian religion, and which contains a moſt important truth, both of religion and philoſophy, being that upon which the happineſs of man in the next world muſt depend, and I may add alſo in this. It is this, that we are but ſojourners or paſſengers in this life, and that, therefore, we can expect no fixed or permanent happineſs in it, but muſt look foreward to the next, where we muſt be happy or miſerable according to our behaviour here. This is a doctrine which our Saviour very much inculcates, telling his diſciples again and again, *That his kingdom was not of this world;* and it is a doctrine that would be readily liſtened to by philoſophers, who believed in the immortality of the ſoul, and in a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. Plato ſays that the chief ſubject of the meditation of a philoſopher, and, as I underſtand him, the moſt pleaſant ſubject, is *death*, by which he is to be diſencumbered of this priſon of fleſh and blood, and reſtored to the enjoyment of his intellectual mind, without being

* See the works of the Emperor Julian, Epiſt. 52. where we have an account of men having their eſtates confiſcated, being driven into exile, and many of them put to death, on account of their religious belief; and, for the ſame reaſon, whole villages in ſeveral countries which he names, deſolated and laid waſte. And the ſubject of diſpute was the myſtery of the Trinity, of which it was impoſſible that the vulgar could think juſtly, or agree in opinion, if they thought of it at all. Even ſome of the Fathers of the church did not underſtand it; and particularly St Auguſtine, though he ſtudied it very much, and has written 15 books upon the ſubject, was ſo far from underſtanding it, that, in his fifth book, *De Trinitate*, cap. 9. he ſays, that there were not three perſons only in the Trinity, but that there might be any other number.

† St Math. chap. 10. v. 34.

being diſturbed by the many wants and avocations of his animal life. *Death*, therefore, ſo far from being an object of terror to ſuch a philoſopher, is to be wiſhed, and earneſtly deſired, by him. Of this, Plotinus, an Alexandrian philoſopher, whoſe life Porphyry has written, was a remarkable example; for when he was advanced in years, but long before he died, he wiſhed earneſtly for death, though he would not uſe any means to procure it; thinking that he was bound to keep the ſtation allotted to him in this life, as long as it pleaſed his Maker, who had put him there. And if an Heathen philoſopher is not afraid to die, but on the contrary wiſhes it, much more will a good Chriſtian: And, accordingly, St Paul calls out with a kind of enthuſiaſm, "Who ſhall deliver me from the body "of this death *."

Thus, I think, I have ſhown, that our Saviour came in fulneſs of time, as it is very well expreſſed in Scripture; that is, juſt when it was proper for him to come, and not ſooner;—when men were ſo far advanced in arts, ſciences, and philoſophy, as to be able to comprehend, and be diſpoſed to embrace, ſo ſublime a religion. If he had come ſooner, that is *in the days of ignorance*, as the apoſtle expreſſes it, I am perſuaded the ſalvation he offered would not have been well received. This is evident from the difficulty that is found to make converts among the barbarous nations. The Moravian Miſſionaries were ſeven years in Greenland without making one convert; and, I am afraid, they have not yet made many. A company of them, as I am informed, went to Guinea; but they all died, without making one convert, as far as I could learn. But the Jews themſelves furniſh the ſtrongeſt evidence of the neceſſity of arts and ſciences, for making men fit to embrace the Chriſtian religion. Jeſus Chriſt lived among them and wrought very many miracles, ſufficient, one ſhould think, to have convinced the moſt obſtinate unbelievers.

* Romans, chap. 7. v. 24.

believers. He ſuffered martyrdom alſo among them, and was raiſed from the dead. Yet the apoſtles made many fewer converts among them, than among any of the Gentiles: So far, indeed, from being converted themſelves, they oppoſed moſt vehemently the progreſs of the apoſtles among the Gentiles, as is evident from many paſſages in the Acts of the Apoſtles, and particularly from one, where it is recorded, that when Paul was in Lyſtra, a city of Lycaonia in Aſia, and was going on moſt ſucceſsfully in converting the inhabitants, there came Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who raiſed the people againſt this apoſtle, *and having ſtoned Paul, drew him out of the city, ſuppoſing he had been dead**. And the reaſon was, that, being naturally a very dull people, as they are repreſented even by the fathers of the church, and altogether unlearned, they were ſo obſtinately attached to the Moſaic law, and all its forms and ceremonies, (a yoke, which, as Peter ſaid, in the council of the apoſtles and elders, neither they nor their forefathers were able to bear†, and which was impoſed upon them, on account of the hardneſs of their hearts, and their propenſity to idolatry), that they could not bear a religion which laid aſide all thoſe forms and ceremonies, ſo many in number, and required nothing but a worſhip from the heart in ſpirit and truth. And there was another doctrine of Chriſtianity, to the belief of which, I am perſuaded, they were averſe; and that was, the immortality of the ſoul and a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. This doctrine was not taught them by Moſes, for the ſame reaſon that he did not teach them many other things, the hardneſs of their hearts, and the dulneſs of their underſtanding, which made them incapable to comprehend how they could live after they were dead. The promiſes, therefore, and threatnings in the Legiſlation of Moſes, are all confined to the things of this life, which they could readily comprehend: Whereas the doctrine of the Goſpel is quite the contrary;

* Acts of the Apoſtles, chap. 14. v. 19.

† Ibid. chap. 15. v. 10.

contrary; for by it we are directed, as I have ſaid, to put our truſt entirely in the life to come, and not at all in the things of this life. It was, therefore, to theſe only that the Jews looked, wiſhing and hoping that the kingdom of Iſrael ſhould be reſtored to its antient independent ſituation, the greateſt happineſs they thought they could enjoy. And, at this day, when Chriſtianity is the religion of Europe and of ſome part of Aſia, they continue unbelievers, and are in the moſt ſingular ſituation that any nation ever was in; for they are diſperſed, I may ſay, all over the world, and yet continue a nation without a country, and ſtill obſtinately attached to their religion, cuſtoms, and manners.

I have already obſerved *, that the Heathen religion, was very deſtructive of the animal race, by offering ſo many of them to be ſacrificed to the Gods. This, I have ſaid, muſt certainly have been very offenſive to a wiſe and good God, who muſt be ſuppoſed to deſire the preſervation and happineſs of the whole race of animals, as far as is conſiſtent with the general ſyſtem of nature. But as intelligence muſt always act according to ſyſtem, and the Supreme Intelligenc emore than any other, ſo in the progreſs of man, in religion as well as in other things, we ſee that every thing went on in regular order; ſo that man could not at once attain to true religion, but muſt have formed one ſuitable to the degree of intelligence which he had acquired. And as there was nothing more natural than his believing that his offering to his Gods what he eſteemed moſt valuable, would render them propitious, from thence aroſe thoſe ſacrifices of animals, even by hundreds, which he made, and burnt, that the odour might aſcend to the ſkies, where he ſuppoſed the Gods dwelt.

This enormity God *winked at* (as the apoſtle ſays) in the days of ignorance, and tolerated even in his choſen people the Jews, among

* Page 384.

whom very many animals were ſacrificed upon different occaſions; for this rite of worſhip was ſo univerſally practiſed among all the nations in their neighbourhood, and they had been ſo much accuſtomed to it while they were in Egypt, that, if Moſes had prohibited it, they would not have received his laws, but would have conformed to the general practice, and have offered ſacrifices to the idols of the nations. And Moſes, in this as well as in many other articles, appears only to have changed the object of the worſhip, not the rites and ceremonies of it, as, I think, Spencer has very clearly ſhown in his work above quoted; and, indeed, I think, that, without changing the courſe of nature, and the general rules of the ſyſtem of the human ſpecies, by which they muſt make a regular progreſs in religion, as well as in other things, God could not have acted otherwiſe with reſpect to the Jews.

But our Saviour having come *in the fulneſs of time*, when the minds of men, by the progreſs they had made in arts and ſciences, were prepared to receive a better religion, ſacrifices, as well as many other rites and ceremonies, were laid aſide altogether, and a pure religion was eſtabliſhed, by which the true God was to be worſhipped in ſpirit and in truth, *not by the works of mens hands*, as the apoſtle ſays *. At the ſame time, I am not of opinion, that all the rites and ceremonies of the Pagan worſhip were ordained by the goſpel to be laid aſide. And particularly one part of their worſhip, I mean muſic, is very properly continued in the Chriſtian church; not becauſe we are to ſuppoſe that God is pleaſed or entertained with our muſic, but becauſe muſic, if it be proper church muſic, muſt have a great effect upon the minds of men, (who muſt be governed more or leſs by their ſenſes), in exciting them to devotion. And, accordingly, as I have elſewhere obſerved †, it was chiefly by muſic,

* Acts of the Apoſtles, chap. 17. v. 24. and 29.

† Page 95. and 101. of this vol.

muſic, that the moſt ſavage people we read of, the Paraguayſe, were converted to Chriſtianity; and, I am perſuaded, if it were more uſed by the Miſſionaries, among the barbarous nations, they would ſucceed better.

As to the time when our Saviour came to eſtabliſh his religion on this earth, I have obſerved that it was in the *fulneſs of time*, according to Scripture language, with reſpect to arts and ſciences; and I will now ſhow, that it was alſo in fulneſs of time with regard to the ſtate of the human ſpecies at that time. That men are at preſent very much degenerated both in mind and body, and that they live in ſuch a way that their numbers are daily decreaſing, I think, I have clearly proved in the third volume of this work. As to numbers, I think, I will prove very clearly in the ſequel of this work, that they are decreaſed, and continually decreaſing ſo much, that, in not very many generations, the ſpecies muſt die out, though it were not to be deſtroyed by any convulſion of nature, ſuch as is foretold in our ſacred books. Now, this degeneracy of man, and deſolation of the earth, was begun, and had gone on for many years, before the days of Auguſtus Cæſar. The great empires of the Aſſyrians, Medes, Perſians, and Macedonians, no longer exiſted. Of all thoſe antient empires, none remained but the Roman, which was eſtabliſhed at a great expence of the human ſpecies, even in Italy itſelf, the ſeat of that empire; for Italy was ſo much depopulated, that colonies were brought from other countries to repeople it; and particularly Conſtantine the Emperor ſettled there 300,000 Sarmatians*. As to arts and ſciences, they were likewiſe upon the decline. Egypt, once the fountain and ſeat of all arts and ſciences, from which they were propagated all over the world, and which, at one time, was the beſt governed country that ever exiſted, had become, in the days of Auguſtus Cæſar, a Roman province, not famous for arts and ſciences, nor for any thing elſe. Greece was no longer the country

* Vol. V. of Origin of Language, p. 25.

country that it had been; and though its inhabitants ſtill preſerved arts and ſciences among them to a certain degree, yet they were not ſuch as had been in former times. And as to the Romans, what arts and ſciences were among them, they had learned from the Greeks, but never carried them to ſuch perfection as the Greeks did. With reſpect to the arts, they never had painters, ſtatuaries, or ſculptors, of any note; nor were they eminent in any ſcience that I know: And as to philoſophy, they had not ſo much as a ſchool of it. Nor were men, at that time, improved in morals any more than in arts and ſciences; but, on the contrary, there was a general corruption of manners, in every nation then known, more or leſs, and particularly among the Romans, as their own hiſtorians inform us. That things have grown better ſince the days of Auguſtus Cæſar, no body will affirm; but, on the contrary, vice and diſeaſe have greatly increaſed, and depopulation, within theſe laſt four or five hundred years, has gone on to a ſurpriſing degree, not only in the countries known in antient times, but in a new world unknown to the antients, there has been ſuch depopulation, as there is no example of the like in the hiſtory of man. And as to arts and ſciences, by learning thoſe of the antient world, we confeſs how much we are fallen off in that article.

Such being the ſtate of man at the time that our Saviour came to the world, it was very proper that he ſhould let them know that there would be ſoon a change of this ſcene of man, for which they ought to prepare themſelves by a religious and virtuous life: And to conſider this life as a tranſient ſtate of trial and probation, which was ſoon to have an end; and, therefore, not to look for any permanent happineſs in it, but to put their truſt in the life to come; which, as I have ſaid*, is a principal doctrine of the Chriſtian religion.

As

* Page 387. and 392.

As the Jews were a people choſen by God, and kept diſtinguiſhed and ſeparated from all other nations, and as they were the only people then on the earth, who believed in one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, it was proper that our Saviour ſhould be of that nation: So that the prophecies, which foretold that the Meſſiah was to be of that nation, might be fulfilled in him. Accordingly, he was born in Jeruſalem, and his mother, the Virgin Mary, was deſcended of the nobleſt race among them, the race of David, the King, who, with the reſt of his countrymen, was deſcended of Abraham, to whom it was promiſed, *That in him ſhould all families of the earth be bleſſed**. It was alſo fit, that the doctrine of Jeſus ſhould be firſt promulgated among the Jews, who believed in the one God, from whom it came; nor do I think, that, in any other nation, our Saviour could have found diſciples to propagate his doctrine, firſt among the Jews, and then among the Gentiles.

As our Saviour ſaid that he was the Son of God, miracles were neceſſary to ſupport his high title, and give credit to his miſſion; and, accordingly, he wrought many miracles, and in the view of all the people, and which were all works of benificence, ſhowing divine goodneſs, as well as divine power. And he concluded them all by raiſing himſelf from the dead, after he had been crucified by the Jews, contrary to the inclination, as appeared, of the Roman governor, Pontius Pilate; but he, in this, ſubmitted to the will of the Jews, who could not bear any other religion than that of Moſes. After his death and reſurrection, his diſciples, who had alſo the power of working miracles beſtowed upon them, and had a very great miracle exhibited in their own perſons, I mean the gift of tongues, which was neceſſary to propagate their religion among the Gentiles, laboured very much in their calling, and were very ſucceſsful in making converts among the Gentiles, much more ſucceſsful than among their own countrymen, who, as I have obſerved,

* Geneſis, chap. 12. v. 3.

ed, did all they could to ſtop their progreſs. But beſides the miracles they wrought, and their gift of tongues, they were aſſiſted by the Holy Spirit, which animated them, and ſome of their converts, and made them go on ſo ſucceſsfully, that, in not very many years, a conſiderable part of Greece and Italy was converted to Chriſtianity.

As to the general ſtate of religion of this earth at preſent, I have already obſerved, that Chriſtianity is the religion of Europe; for even where the Turks are the Sovereigns, the Chriſtian religion is prevalent. It alſo prevails in ſeveral parts of Aſia, and even in Egypt, particularly in the country about Alexandria, where they have a Patriarch; and have joined together Judaiſm and Chriſtianity in one remarkable particular, the obſerving both the Chriſtian and Jewiſh Sabbaths. In the weſtern parts of Aſia, Mahomediſm is the prevailing religion; and in the eaſtern parts, ſuch as India, China, and Japan, the popular religion of Egypt, which was brought to India by Oſiris, is predominant. Into India, it appears, that the Egyptians imported their philoſophy, as well as their popular religion; for among the Bramins of India the doctrine of the Trinity is an article of faith*. Of the nations of Africa we know ſo little, that we cannot ſay what their religion is. And I have only been informed by a negro, who is emancipated, and has embraced the Chriſtian religion, and whom I had an opportunity of ſeeing in Edinburgh, that, in his nation, they practice circumciſion; and alſo, that they performed an operation upon the women, which is called in Greek εκτεμνειν, and which was only practiſed in Egypt, but not in Judea. So it appears, that this nation of negroes learned the practice of circumciſion from the Egyptians. As to the New World on the other ſide of the Atlantic, all we know with any certainty of the religion of the inhabitants there, is, that the nations of North America have got the knowledge, as I have elſewhere obſerved †, of one Superior Being,

* Page 292. † Page 153. and 368.

ing, whom they call the Great Spirit, and in whoſe name they make their treaties.

And this may ſuffice for the hiſtory of Religion, of which, I think, I have ſaid as much as was proper in a work of this kind. I have alſo given the hiſtory of Arts and Sciences, and likewiſe of Government; which, together with Religion, comprehend what I call the Hiſtory of Man, at leaſt in the ſtate of civil ſociety: For, as intelligence is of the eſſence of man, and that which diſtinguiſhes him from other animals on this earth, I conſider his hiſtory to be that of the operations of his intellectual faculty, which are all guided and directed by the three things I have mentioned, arts and ſciences, government and religion; as it is by theſe that his character, ſentiments, manners, cuſtoms, and inſtitutions, are produced. As to the various events that have happened in the ſeveral nations of this earth, ſuch as wars, conqueſts, migrations of nations, and revolutions of government, they are the ſubject of what is commonly called Hiſtory; but they are no part of what I call the Hiſtory of Man: Nor, indeed, do I pay much regard to them in reading the hiſtories of particular nations, except in ſo far as they ſhow the characters of men; for, otherwiſe conſidered, they are things which might have happened or not happened, and therefore cannot be the ſubject of any ſcience.

And here I conclude this volume of Metaphyſics, which, though it has run out to a great length, much greater than I expected, does not finiſh the hiſtory of Man. For I have a great deal to add upon the natural life of man, which neceſſarily preceded his life of civility and arts: Then I am to ſhow the difference betwixt theſe two lives, and all the evils which ariſe from the civiliſed life: And this will naturally lead me to that great queſtion of Metaphyſics, with which I propoſe to conclude this work, concerning the *origin of evil* in this ſtate of man, and how it is to be reconciled with the wiſdom and

goodneſs of God. And, in that part of the work, I hope, I ſhall be able to ſhow, that all thoſe evils are abſolutely neceſſary, unleſs the order of nature, and the whole ſyſtem of man, had been altered; but, that the providence of God has ſo ordered matters, that good ſhould ariſe out of evil, which is the greateſt work of wiſdom; ſo that man, after all his ſufferings in this life, or in another, ſhall at laſt enjoy all the happineſs of which his nature is capable. And thus, I hope,

I may aſſert eternal Providence,
And juſtify the ways of God to men.

Milton's Par. Loſt.

APPEN-

APPENDIX.

[See page 34. of this Volume.]

Paris, Friday, 28th March 1765.

"THIS day ſaw and converſed with Mademoiſelle le Blanc (ſothey called her).—Says that ſhe remembers the country, ſhe came from, is a very cold country, covered with ſnow a great part of the year, and the nights very long. That the children there are accuſtomed to the water from the moment of their birth--that they learn to ſwim as ſoon as they can walk; and alſo to climb trees—and that a child of a year old, there, will climb up a tree. That they live in little huts above the water like Beavers; and that they ſubſiſt very much by fiſhing. That ſhe was ſo much in the uſe of the water, that, when ſhe came to France, ſhe could not live without it; and, at firſt, was in uſe to plunge into it over head and ears, and to dwell in it like an Otter, or any other amphibious animal; and afterwards, when ſhe was reſtrained from that, ſhe always waſhed her head and hands. That, though ſhe ſuppoſes ſhe was a child only about ſeven or eight years of age when ſhe was carried away, yet, by that time, ſhe had learned to ſwim, to fiſh, to ſhoot with the bow and arrow, to climb, and to leap from one tree to another like a ſquirrel. That the people of her country had no clothing but ſkins, and had no uſe of fire at all: So that, when ſhe came to France, fire was her abhorrence; and ſhe could not even bear the cloſe air of a room, nor the breaths of people that were near her. That there were another ſort of men in her country, who were bigger and ſtronger men than her people, and all covered with hair; and that theſe people were at war with her people, and uſed to eat them when they could catch them. That ſhe had, when ſhe was catched, in a pouch by her ſide, a club with ſome characters upon it, which expreſſed her name, and the

perſons to whom ſhe belonged; and this club is in the poſſeſſion of the heirs of the Comte d'Epinoy. That, young as ſhe was, ſhe had the knowledge of ſeveral plants and roots, which were good for the ſtomach and head, and could cure wounds; and that ſhe fed upon certain roots, which ſhe dug out of the ground with her fingers, and particularly with her thumb, which, by that means, was broader and larger than the thumbs of the people of this country; and when ſhe leapt from one branch of a tree to another, ſhe uſed to hold by her thumbs, and pitch herſelf upon them as well as upon her feet. That ſhe could not bear to lie upon any thing that was ſoft; and that, at firſt, when ſhe came to France, ſhe uſed a ſtone by way of pillow. That when ſhe was taken from her own country, ſhe was at ſea in a little round canoe, which children uſe in that country. In this canoe ſhe was ſet, and cloſe ſhut in with ſome kind of covering that drew cloſe about her; and, when the waves came, ſhe ducked, and let them paſs over her. That ſhe was taken and carried to ſome diſtant and warm country, where ſhe was ſold for a ſlave; that ſhe was re-embarked with her maſter to come to this part of the world. That her maſter wanted to make her work with the needle, at a ſort of work which obliged her to crouch and look up; and that he beat her when ſhe would not work; but that her miſtreſs, who, ſhe believes, ſpoke French, was very kind to her, and would hide her when her maſter was ſeeking her to make her work. That the ill uſage of her maſter made her ſo furious, that they were obliged to chain her, and confine her to the hold, where ſhe made acquaintance with a negro girl older than herſelf. That, when they came upon the coaſt ſomewhere in Europe, the ſhip being in diſtreſs, the crew took to the boat, and ſhe, together with the negro girl, were thrown into the ſea to ſhift for themſelves; and they ſwam aſhore, ſhe aſſiſting the negro girl, who could not ſwim ſo well, and who was kept above water by taking hold of her foot. That, after ſhe was ſold as a ſlave, ſhe was painted all over black, except her feet, which ſtill remained.

remained white; but the negro was black all over. That ſhe could have imitated the ſinging of any bird, and that imitation was the only kind of muſic known in her country. That any kind of victuals prepared with fire diſagreed with her extremely; and ſhe remembers particularly, that ſoon after ſhe was catched in Champagne, obſerving a woman feeding a child with warm milk, ſhe held up her mouth and got a little of it, which affected her ſo much, that ſhe lay as dead for ſome time. That any fleſh ſhe ate, that was either ſalted, or prepared with fire, did not digeſt with her, but turned into bile, by which ſhe was reduced to the laſt extremity: And the phyſicians, in order to change her habit, and put French blood into her veins, blooded her, till the blood ſtopt of itſelf; by which means, and by her change of diet and manner of life, her health is quite impaired, ſo that ſhe cannot now perform any of thoſe wonderful feats of agility and ſtrength, which ſhe formerly performed; and ſhe cannot even utter thoſe ſhrill cries, which uſed to alarm people ſo much formerly. She ſays, that when ſhe was taken in her own country, ſhe had only the little bludgeon above mentioned: But in the country ſhe was carried to, before ſhe came to Europe, ſhe got a longer ſtick, with three pieces of iron at the end of it; one in the middle ſharp and pointed, and the other two, each on the ſide of it, hooked; and the uſe ſhe made of it was to ſtab any wild beaſt, that attacked her, with the ſharp point, and with the hooks to catch the branches of trees, in order to aſſiſt her in climbing; and ſhe ſaid it was particularly uſeful to her in defending her againſt the bears, when they attempted to follow her up the trees. She ſays that ſhe remembers the cuſtom of funerals in her country; that the defunct is carried to a place where there is a great deal of ſnow, where he is ſet upon his breech in a ſort of cage, not unlike an eaſy chair. That his relations approach him with many reverences and proſtrations, and the neareſt relation makes a ſpeech to him, which ſhe repeats in her own language, importing that he has eyes, ears, hands,

hands, arms, &c. yet is no more, but is gone above to the moſt high; and then the ceremony is concluded with what ſhe calls *un cri de triſteſſe*, which is a cry that they alſo uſe upon occaſion of any danger or diſtreſs, and which ſhe remembers to have uſed upon a particular occaſion to the terror and aſtoniſhment of the whole neighbourhood. Beſides this ſervice of the dead, ſhe has preſerved ſeveral words and phraſes of her language, particularly the name of a little bludgeon, which is *Boutou* *; and her longer ſtick, with the iron upon it, ſhe calls *Tribiee*, which is probably a word of the country where ſhe got it. The phraſe for wounding one, is *to make him red*, and for killing, *to make him ſleep long*; and, by way of ſalutation, they ſay, *I ſee you*. It appears that ſhe muſt have been ſome conſiderable time in the country where ſhe was firſt landed, after ſhe was taken from her own country; for ſhe ſays, in that country, ſhe got her *Tribiee*, and learned the uſe of it; and ſhe remembers very well, that ſhe was a long time in the poſſeſſion of a man who wanted to make her work and, on that account, as ſhe ſaid before, beat her and treated her very ill; and ſhe remembers very well, that his wife was a handſome tall woman, who was very kind to her, and uſed to hide her, when her huſband was ſeeking her to make her work. And it was, no doubt, with a view to ſell her as a negro ſlave that they painted her black. That the female negro, that ſhe had with her in the woods of Champagne, ſhe firſt became acquainted with aboard the ſhip; that the negreſs could not ſwim very well, but ſhe helped her. The negreſs did not ſpeak the language of Mademoiſelle le Blanc's country, but had ſome words of French, and beſides ſeemed to

* This is a word of the Caribbee language, mentioned by Sieur la Beaud in his account of the Caribbees, who has deſcribed this weapon, and particularly taken notice of ſome gravings upon it, by way of ornament, filled up with painting. Of this graving, upon her *Boutou*, this girl ſpoke much; ſo that, I think, there can be no doubt, but that ſhe got this weapon among the Caraïbes, in one of the Antilles Iſlands, which certainly was the warm country to which ſhe was brought, after ſhe was taken away from her own.

to have a language of her own, of which Mad. le Blanc remembers a word, *Broutut*, ſignifying *bread* or *ſomething to eat*. As to her own language, Mad. le Blanc remembers but very few words of it; and what ſhe repeats, as the language of her country, is chiefly French words, ſpoken in the tone and manner of her own country: From which manner, it would appear, that the language of her country is little better than inarticulate ſounds from the throat, in the formation of which the organs of the mouth have very little ſhare. For ſhe told me that ſhe did not move her tongue at all in ſpeaking, and that, when ſhe came to France, ſhe had no uſe of her tongue, except in ſwallowing; and her mouth was much leſs than it is at preſent, and almoſt round. And when ſhe laughed, ſhe did not open her mouth as we do, but made a little motion, with her upper lip, and a noiſe in her throat, by drawing her breath inwards. That when ſhe was in the woods with her companion, ſhe converſed with her by ſigns, and certain cries, ſome of which ſhe remembers, particularly after they had ſwum the river together, near to Songi, ſhe got firſt out; and having catched fiſh, that ſhe thought ſufficient for them both, ſhe gave a call to the negreſs to come to her. That after this a quarrel happened betwixt them about a ſtring of beads, of which, a Gentleman of the name of St Martin, was witneſs; the ſame who fired a ſhot at her in paſſing the river, but of which ſhe knew nothing at the time. That the Gentleman, upon ſeeing them come out of the water, and run and leap in the manner they did, was exceedingly frightened, and fell ſick of the fright. That, after ſhe had knocked down her companion, and ſaw her lying bleeding upon the ground, ſhe had compaſſion upon her, and run, as that Gentleman ſaid, with a velocity that is not to be conceived, and catched a frog, which ſhe put upon her companion's head that ſhe had broke, and tied it on with ſome threads that ſhe made of the bark of a tree. That ſhe thinks ſhe muſt have been very young, not above ſeven or eight years of age, when ſhe was taken from her own country, becauſe

cauſe ſhe was put into the little round canoe, into which they put children, in order to accuſtom them to the ſea: For they are put into it with a thing like a purſe that draws cloſe about their middle, ſo as to keep the water from coming in, by which means the water might paſs over the child, and the canoe might be overturned never ſo often, but it could not ſink; and, in this way, ſhe ſays, the children were taught to ſwim. That ſhe believes ſhe was a conſiderable time in the country, to which ſhe was firſt carried, where ſhe learned the uſe of the *Tribiee*, as above mentioned, and likewiſe to ſhoot with the bow and arrow. That, after ſhe had eſcaped from the laſt ſhip, in which ſhe was embarked, ſhe remembers that ſhe paſt through great tracts of country with her companion; and ſhe remembers particularly that ſhe was in one country, where ſhe ſaw a great number of people dancing. That ſhe and her companion lived upon roots, and upon what game they could catch. That what they killed, they ſucked the blood of, while it was warm, and eat the fleſh immediately. That ſhe remembers they killed a fox, but found the fleſh very bad, ſo that they only ſucked the blood. They alſo catched a hind, and, after having ſucked the milk of it, they eat the fleſh."

As I thought this Girl, who had been born and bred a ſavage, and could give ſo good an account of that ſtate by her ſpeaking the French language, the greateſt curioſity I had ever ſeen, I had many other converſations with her, and learned ſeveral other particulars of her manner of life, which I have mentioned in other parts of this work.

FINIS.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

NOV 3 1964 LD URL

AUG 11'82

INTER-LIBRARY LOANS
RECEIVED
MAIN LOAN DESK
OCT 13 1964
NOV 12 1964
A.M. 7|8|9|10|11|12|1|2|3|4|5|6 P.M.

OCT 6 1986
REC'D LD-URL
JUL 07 1986

MAR 24 1972
MAR 23 1972

LD URL
FEB 24'81

2-9-82 LL

Form L9—37m-3,'57(C5424s4)444

*B
111
M74a
v.4

Monboddo -
Antient meta-
physics

3 1158 00734 0382

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY
D 000 015 97

*B
111
M74a
v.4

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY LOS ANGELES

University Research Library

IBM L30202

B 111 M74A 3

CALL NUMBER
SER
VOL
PT
COP
AUTHOR

BUI
U